

# BOSTON REVIEW.

VOL. I.—SEPTEMBER, 1861.—No. 5.

---

## ARTICLE I.

### GOD'S ARCHERS.

A MISCELLANEOUS company of young men — brought together by such a chapter of accidents as belongs peculiarly to an idle winter day in a New England village — were sitting about in a carpenter's shop on benches and bits of lumber whittling sticks and talking a variety of nonsense. A short, stout, dark-haired fellow sat on a higher bench than the others, and did not whittle, but grasped at both ends the wooden handle of an auger which he had taken up without seeming to know it. He had an intelligent black eye, and a thoughtful and pensive — almost sad — expression of countenance. When he spoke, which was seldom, all listened, but his gravity was not relaxed, even when he provoked shouts of laughter from all the rest by what they considered his happy hits.

Presently there came in another young man whom they all knew. He had gone from the village Academy to College a few years before, and was then studying for the ministry at a Theological Seminary. His entrance suddenly arrested the stream of talk, and excited an interest and an evident satisfaction, which a stranger might have noticed without being able to guess the reason of it. The young men were thoughtless, and affected to be sceptical, while the student was a sincere and devout Christian. It might have been observed that the eyes of

the company were turned to the dark-eyed thoughtful young man with an expression of mischievous expectation. He understood, without seeming to notice it, and contrived to draw the Theologian, by a few quiet remarks, into an argument on Christianity. It was soon apparent that he was a sceptic and a champion. With an adroitness which was evidently the result of training, he pressed, point after point, the current infidel objections, till the Theologian, inexperienced and drawn too easily from his bastions by this guerilla warfare, became confused and baffled. The company applauded, the dark-eyed champion of infidelity was thoughtful and grave, while the baffled champion of the faith was silent and wept. This was confessing defeat, and the company applauded with increased vehemence: but their champion did not smile. If they had watched they might have seen a sudden pang depicted on his countenance as if an adder had stung him. In a single instant, like a terrible earthquake, those silent tears had loosened all his foundations, and the fabric which he had been building up so proudly came tumbling with a crash of wild confusion about him that made his loins to shake. Yet all was comprised in a single conviction which darted like a burning ray from the face of God into his soul: — "He is right, and I am wrong." All his cavils and questionings were only a spider's web now, that terrible ray from the face of God scorched them up in a moment. It set his conscience on fire, and he felt himself burning in a consuming heat, which nothing could extinguish. Day and night God's hand was heavy upon him; his moisture was turned into the drought of summer. He said with himself, that God might hear, "I will renounce my infidel notions; I will admit that Christianity is true." It was in vain; conscience still gnawed him, like a worm, burned him like a flame. He determined to do another thing: — he would go to the prayer-meeting, where his pious widowed mother had so often tried in vain to persuade him to go. He would, however, tell nobody the reason, nor should anybody know what was passing in his mind. To the prayer-meeting accordingly he went, but still in vain. God's fire was consuming him, his soul was filled with anguish. At last, when all his experiments had failed, and he could hold out no longer, he went to the Christian

student, confessed to him all that was in his heart, listened to his faithful counsels, and laid down forever the weapons of his rebellion at the feet of the Lord Jesus Christ. That wayward son of a pious widow, having passed through College and the Theological Seminary, is now an able minister of the New Testament.

What precisely was the process which commenced in that carpenter's shop, and terminated in the open confession of his faith in Christ, we know not, nor does it signify. Whether, according to the popular theory of conversion, that was the commencement of God's work of grace in his heart, or whether, as we believe, he had been converted before, and that was the crisis in which the painful conflict between the conscience and the speculative understanding ceased, by the full and final surrender of the latter, and the springing up of hope toward God in his heart, affects not at all our argument. It is plain that the whole question was suddenly transferred from the domain of the understanding to that of the conscience. Whether his objections were susceptible of a direct solution or not, — whether they related to mysteries, far out of human vision, and so not properly subjects for speculative inquiry, or were the stale and worn-out quibbles of infidelity, — matters not in the least. He felt that all his reasonings were frivolous, though his antagonist had failed to overturn them. That verdict was in the far higher court of conscience. If the young Theologian had been a practised archer, a single well-directed arrow aimed at the conscience would have accomplished more than all the schools of metaphysical theologians could ever have achieved.

It will not of course be supposed that we altogether decry the use of the speculative understanding in relation to the things of God and human salvation. But there must in any wise be a careful discrimination. The Divine revelations make their appeal to every faculty of the human soul, and furnish full scope for the honest exercise of all. Whosoever will may gird up the loins of his understanding, his reason, his conscience, or his heart, and God will meet him and prove his strength. Or if the foundations of Christianity be assailed by the lying subtlety of infidels, the sophistries and lies of the whole tribe, from Tom Paine to the Oxford Essayists, must be cut up by the

roots, or at least *to* the roots, as from year to year we mow down briars, which will be still reappearing. But as mowing the briars is a very small thing toward the construction of a garden of flowers or the rearing of an oak grove, so all that can be done for God by discoursing to the speculative understanding, never brought the first man to the precincts of the temple, even to the court of the gentiles. The way to the holiest of all is through that court, as it is likewise through the midst of the money-changers and those who sell doves: but he who tarries there will find it a den of thieves. Paul at Athens conciliates the attention of his audience by a courteous allusion to their religious habits, and still farther pins them to his discourse by an argument on the Divine Spirituality, shaped to their Athenian culture; but all this is only incidental — a rapid march over the course which brings him to his main point, which is to thunder in the conscience the great doctrine of the judgment-day.

What we are chiefly concerned to affirm is, that, while God in his revelations, addresses every attribute of man, he makes his appeal ultimately to the conscience, and to every other faculty subordinately, as mere outposts of the main citadel: while more frequently he dashes right through the outposts, and plants his batteries beneath the very walls of the citadel itself.

The incident which we have related, somewhat in detail, seems to us to exhibit this great law of the Divine procedure, and to illustrate for the preacher the vast importance of making his appeal more to the conscience and less to the speculative understanding. It has been said by an English critic that the American pulpit, as compared with that of England and Scotland, is characterized by this very thing, — its more direct and habitual appeals to the conscience. We would gladly be persuaded that the fact is so, but we have thought that the preaching of New England at least was open to grave criticism on the ground that the speculative, not to say the rationalistic element had largely crept in; and we have been inclined to attribute this fact, in great measure, to the influence of the younger Edwards, whose controversial and theological writings exhibit an Athenian character which carries it with almost, if not quite a preponderance against the Pauline. Of the elder Edwards



the precise contrary was most conspicuously true. He was an eminent and masterly instance and illustration of our leading idea. Never since Paul was there a preacher more remarkable for his reliance, under God, on his direct and naked appeals to the conscience for the success of his ministry. His success was in proportion, as he himself informs us, in his "Narrative of Surprising Conversions": —

"I think I have found that no discourses have been more remarkably blessed, than those in which the doctrine of God's absolute sovereignty with regard to the salvation of sinners, and his just liberty in regard to answering the prayers, or succeeding the pains of mere natural men, continuing such, have been insisted on. I never found so much immediate saving fruit, in any measure, of any discourses I have offered to my congregation, as some from those words, Rom. iii. 19, 'That every mouth may be stopped;' endeavoring to show from thence that it would be just with God forever to reject and cast off mere natural men." (Works, Vol. III. p. 34.)

To us it appears plain, to a demonstration, that the Holy Scriptures and sound philosophy point both in the same direction, in relation to this matter, and shut us up to one conclusion. Conscience is that principle or attribute in man which has to do directly with the question of right and wrong, and so with the Divine justice and sovereignty, and human guilt, and the atonement, and regeneration, and justification, and eternal judgment. We cannot agree with those who find in this great principle of our nature nothing more than an emotion, — as Brown and Sir James Mackintosh. Paul evidently meant far more by conscience, (*συνείδησις*) than an emotion. Nothing is more changing and uncertain than emotion; whereas Paul speaks of something fixed, and permanent, and universal; which knows neither climate nor race, barbarism nor civilization, Christianity nor paganism; but is found alike everywhere and in all men, judging, deciding, approving or censuring, commanding or forbidding, pronouncing sentence of acquittal or condemnation, according to an ultimate and immutable law. Thus he tells the Romans that the gentiles, having no written law, are a law unto themselves; because conscience bears witness — pronounces judicial sentence, that is — the law written on the heart. So, too, he proclaims to all the schools of Greek

Philosophy, who assail him with their subtle dialectics, that his is a far higher and bolder aim than they would tie him down to—to wit, that he may commend himself to every man's conscience in the sight of God. And again, with reference to his own responsibility in his work, and his satisfaction therein, he makes conscience even as it were God, and its approval God's voice, when he says to the Corinthians, "For our rejoicing is this, the testimony of our conscience, that in simplicity and godly sincerity, not with fleshly wisdom, but by the grace of God, we have had our conversation in the world, and more abundantly to you-ward." (2 Cor. i. 12.)

At the risk of being thought old-fashioned or behind the times, we are content to abide with the immortal Bishop Butler, in preference to Sir James Mackintosh and the moderns, as regards the nature of conscience, believing that, in so doing, we abide with Paul. "You cannot," he asserts, "form a notion of this faculty, conscience, without taking in judgment, direction, superintendency. . . . Had it strength, as it had right—had it power, as it had manifest authority—it would absolutely govern the world." (Human Nature, Sermon II.) John Howe calls it "a certain dijudicative power." Cicero hits the same point when he describes it as "*recta ratio*," right reason; and in relation to its legal authority, it was called by the ancients "*vera lex*," the true law. "The laws of well-doing are the dictates of right reason," saith the great Richard Hooker. (Eccles. Polity, Book I., section 7.) We conclude, therefore, with M'Cosh, that the human conscience is at once a law, a faculty, and an emotion. "Subject only to God, it reviews all the actions of the responsible agent, and is itself reviewed by none. It is the highest judicatory in the human mind, judging all, and being judged of none; admitting of appeal from all, and admitting of no appeal from itself to any other human tribunal." (Method of the Divine Government, p. 305.)

Not that, in any supposable or possible case, the natural action of conscience is sufficient to bring a man to God. Mofatt found in South Africa savages who had never heard of God, yet suffered exquisite tortures of conscience, for the many murders they had committed, although the murders were sanctioned by the established usages of the tribe. That natural

conscience was God's witness in the savage breast, answering loudly when God's law was proclaimed, and God's Gospel preached. Yet law and Gospel, thundering and flashing in that tumultuous conscience, ten thousand times ten thousand years, could bring nothing but a denser spiritual darkness, a more utter and hopeless spiritual death, until the Holy Spirit of God wrought effectually there by his supernatural and new-creating power. All that we are concerned to say is, that it would be precisely there that the Spirit of God would work; and that precisely there is the point at which all the arrows of the Almighty are ultimately aimed. So Jesus said, "He will convince the world of sin, and of righteousness, and of judgment;" — a process all in the conscience. Nor is it to be conceived as possible in the nature of things, that God should ever convert a man in any other way but through the conscience; since the very first, and always indispensable step is to have a conscience of sin. If any affirm that this is derogatory to the sovereign omnipotence of Jehovah, we ask, is it one whit more so than to allege that God will never make a man hear with the eyes?

It will at least be conceded that conscience is the attribute which has mainly to do with our duty toward God. His approval or his disapproval; his blessing or his curse; reward or punishment; life or death; heaven or hell: — all these stand related, directly and alone, to the question of right and wrong — of moral character and conduct. What is it then but a grand impertinence for any other faculty to put in its claim to adjudicate or decide in these high concerns? Or how can any such claim be, for a single moment, admitted, without diverting the mind from the great business in hand, so blunting the power of conscience, and weakening the power of every appeal. This argument lies with its utmost force against appealing to the speculative understanding, or suffering its interference, except incidentally and subordinately, in matters pertaining to our relations with God. It is a logical faculty, not in any sense moral. Its province includes that which has an indirect and purely incidental relation to our moral obligations; as the genuineness of a Greek manuscript, the harmony of the Evangelists, or fate and free-will; but *no necessary* relation to

our *sense* of right and wrong, or to its proper grounds and proofs. "But every fool will be meddling," Solomon says, and the speculative understanding pretends that the investigation of these incidental and ultimate matters is involved in the question of our personal relations with God and his law.

We join issue. Does not conscience apprehend at once the *grand truths* of God and the creation ; man and his obligation to God ; sin and its curse ; the redemption by Christ and its highest of all obligations upon sinful man, to repent and believe, and the fearful guilt and inevitable consequences of refusing ? Shall the answer to the conscience then be, to challenge the authorship of the Pentateuch, or the inspiration of the Canticles, or the Book of Job ? Shall we go back to Adam, and question the Bible doctrine of our relations with him, and all with a view to impair the evidence of our guilt ? Or, far anterior to Adam and all created existence, shall we seek to penetrate the secret counsel of God, and claim the right to know his relation to the fact of sin, in order to measure the amount and turpitude of our guilt ? Shall the proud and arrogant reason, blind and halt, in its beggarly garments, set up its own standard of moral obligation, and assume that, just as far as, by whatever means, the plenary power of man to keep God's perfect law is impaired, so far the obligation of plenary obedience is abated ; — thus cutting loose altogether, either from the doctrine of man's special and necessary dependence on the Spirit of God, or of his absolute and eternal obligation to keep the law, in its utmost length and breadth ? All this the speculative understanding does, and much more, if more is possible, in the same direction. It objects to God's decree, that it is at war with man's freedom, or else pleads for a freedom which is subversive of the decree. It affects to adjust the different parts of God's revealed truth, or claims the right to reject what cannot be so adjusted. Need it be said that the boasted adjustment will usually be found to be nothing more nor less than the virtual rejection of the Scripture doctrine of Divine Sovereignty ? It will not have a plenary atonement because that, it asserts, would impair the Divine mercy ; — an argument, than which it is not easy to conceive anything more superficial and frivolous, since the mercy and the atonement are alike from God.

And so justification is not justification, and substitution is not substitution, and Christ did not bear our sins, and the Divine justice is not satisfied, and all men are born neither sinful nor holy, but with adequate power to be holy, and go to an everlasting heaven without any help from God, or Jesus Christ, or the Holy Ghost.

The point we are now considering is, how such questionings and cavillings of the speculative understanding are to be met. This is by no means answered when it is asserted that what the speculative understanding can question, the speculative understanding can resolve. The assertion is not true. The busy thoughts of a little child will start many an inquiry whose solution is a thousand times farther off than the farthest fixed star from the grasp of all the philosophers. The attempts which have been made to reconcile the existence of sin and the benevolence of God, do not even relieve the difficulty. We hold all attempts to explain the origin of sin, whether by old school men or new, to be mere childishness. We know exactly nothing at that point, and the things we do know, at other points of this great subject, no grasp of human thought can bring together. The Bible declares the very end and purpose for which the world was created to be, the manifestation of the glory of Jesus Christ in human redemption. That could not be without sin. Does God then choose sin, or did he decree it? The answer is, God hates sin, and that alone; forbids it by the most terrific penalties, and will punish it, in the least instance, with everlasting destruction in hell. Can man or archangel put the two together? They who make the attempt seem to us as little birds that seek entrance to a castle by flying, with their tiny momentum, against its iron gates or granite sides. You stand before an adamant wall as high as heaven. You grope and flounder in blackest midnight. The angry lightning flashes from the frowning face of God's thundercloud, and you are wrapped again in a darkness which is felt, and seems as if it would extinguish your very eyeballs.

Do we then exclude the discussion of the deep things of God? Nay, we enforce it, since they are the things which promote enlargement and strength. In the same proportion they minister to humility, for humility is enlargement and strength;

and they are the very things which appeal with most of commanding force to the conscience. Philosophy may construct a compact and beautiful argument for eternal decrees, proving, to a demonstration, that God could not govern the world without them. But a man accepts the doctrine, not because it approves itself to the speculative understanding, but because, far beyond and above the speculative understanding, it commands the conscience, and, through the conscience, the will and the affections, by the mighty power of the Holy Ghost. And this is precisely the amount of the pretended agreement between Platonism and Calvinism, the pagan philosophy and the teachings of the Bible.

No man, inspired or uninspired, ever exceeded Paul in dialectic skill, in the love of its exercise, or in the power to crush his subtle adversaries by their own weapons. Yet see how habitually he drives his argument right through all such artillery, and home to the conscience, as knowing that the spiking of every gun, and the destruction of every battery amounts to little so long as that stronghold is unassailed. What a clarion ring of celestial warfare is there in his grand response to the Greek philosophers: — "Not walking in craftiness, nor handling the word of God deceitfully, but by manifestation of the truth commending ourselves to every man's conscience in the sight of God." (2 Cor. iv. 2.) So in the presence of the Roman governor he "reasoned of righteousness, temperance, and judgment to come." Every word was a bolt aimed directly at the conscience of Felix; hence he stood pale and trembling. At Thessalonica, too, when he would convict the Jews of the guilt of Christ's death, for three successive Sabbath days he "discoursed to them (*διελέγeto*) out of the Scriptures," — their own, — "opening and alleging that Jesus," the man whom they had killed, "was the Christ," the anointed of God, the promised to their fathers, and hope of their nation. But most striking of all, when he has declared, as a matter of pure revelation, God's absolute sovereignty in the future and eternal destiny of men, even to the hardening of whom he will; and the speculative understanding, as counsel for the proud heart, starts up with its cavil of God's injustice and man's irresponsibility, he dashes all to the ground by one tremendous thunder-peat to

the conscience ; — “Nay, but, O man, who art thou that re-  
plieth against God ?” (Rom. ix. 20.)

It is not alone in relation to such points as the origin of sin, decrees, and reprobation, that the speculative understanding stumbles in its arrogant and vain questionings. There is not a single point of Christian doctrine which it cannot perplex and has not perplexed in the same way ; — perplexed, not as regards the conscience, but itself.

Even granting, however, that it were true that what the speculative understanding can question the speculative understanding can answer, all this is clearly aside of the end in view. Still another question arises, and it is, whether such answer of the speculative understanding is God's answer ; whether it is the answer to the conscience, and tends to conviction of sin and conversion of the soul to God. The obvious and inevitable reply, as we judge, is a direct and emphatic *no*. It is the precise contrary to all this ; it is in the direction of ministering to the pride of reason ; — a ministration how necessarily weakening to the action of conscience, any man can easily see. This is a point to be well considered. The speculative understanding is not moral, in any sense or degree, but purely intellectual. Conscience, on the contrary, is moral ; this is its peculiar characteristic and distinction. Whenever conscience comes into court, it is always to adjudicate in matters of right and wrong. This is no disparagement to the other faculties, they are there too, — perception, memory, understanding, reason, — but only as servitors and secretaries, to turn over the files, hunt up testimony, and keep the records. Conscience is ultimate and supreme. Just as soon, therefore, as any matter is submitted to the speculative understanding it is taken clean out of the court of conscience at once. Conscience may put off its robes and retire. Its voice is no longer heard.

Nor is it to be supposed that any advantage would result even though the decision of the speculative understanding were always coincident with that of the conscience ; since it is the exclusive prerogative of conscience to decide on every question of right and wrong, without such aid. To appeal a case, therefore, from the court of conscience to that of the speculative understanding, or to claim that the understanding is to be even



advisory in the matter, is to degrade the conscience, and so inevitably to impair the force of its decisions. Moreover, if the decision of the conscience may be held in abeyance while we run off to that other court with reference to one point about which a doubt has been raised, so, equally with reference to any and every other; and just so long as there is any uncertainty as to whether this subtle and special-pleading faculty has reached the end of its objections, the authority of conscience is held in suspense; God's voice is not heard; his law is bound. Another hydra, whose heads will grow a great deal faster than you can cut them off.

Again, when it is considered that the speculative understanding usually puts in its plea and its query, not as an honest inquirer, desirous simply to know the truth and obey it, but rather with a view to parry the approach of an unwelcome conviction; to throw up earthworks, behind which the conscience, already partially disturbed and active, may hide itself from God's shafts, the argument acquires cumulative force. When God commands a guilty man to repent or perish, is he in doubt whether he ought to repent, until he has overhauled the question of Adam's sin, or God's connection with the fact of that sin and his own; or the character and measure of his ability in the whole matter? No such thing. The case against him is clear to a demonstration,—clear to the extent of his utter confusion; and he knows it only too well, and feels it all too deeply. His hesitation, therefore, for a single moment, is daring resistance to God, a wilful obstinacy in the wrong, a shameful trifling with his own eternal interests.

If the views which have been presented are correct, they are of the last importance in their bearing upon the Christian pulpit. How shall the preacher order his ministry with reference to its great and divinely appointed end, the conversion and salvation of his hearers? There are men in every community and in every congregation who are ingenious in the way we have been considering. When pressed with arguments addressed to the conscience, they are ever ready to answer by suggestions of the speculative understanding. How shall the preacher treat such suggestions? Demonstrate, it may be, as a wise discretion shall dictate, that they are superficial and frivolous,—the stale



and shop-worn stock in trade of sceptics in every age; or awful mysteries of God, before which a man should stand with uncovered head;—and so, when alleged as objections, not less superficial and frivolous,—as if a man should refuse to eat till he understands how bread is converted into blood. But mainly, reassert the prerogative of conscience, God's vicegerent in the breast, and demand implicit submission to *its* decisions. Insist on the completeness and sufficiency of arguments addressed to the conscience. Tell men, with all plainness, that the suggestions and questionings of the speculative understanding are the result, not of superior intelligence, a profound and philosophic habit of mind, or the caution of a wise and acute analyst in admitting conclusions in a matter of vast and eternal concernment;—but of intellectual pride, vain conceit, and a heart in wicked rebellion against the authority of God. This is the plain truth, and shall the preacher of righteousness, God's ambassador to men in revolt, involve himself in a complicity with the wickedness, by helping men to cover it up? *Helping men to cover it up!* We will venture to assert that that is about the amount of all that was ever accomplished, or ever will be, to the end of the dispensation, by labored replies, with respectful air, to the perverse disputings of the speculative understanding. Did anybody ever hear of a single instance of genuine conversion, as the result of such a process? Or did anybody ever perceive that a man seemed a single hair-breadth nearer to repentance when his speculative objections had been answered, and he silenced?

We incline strongly to the belief that most conversions take place at an earlier period than the speculative understanding comes fully into play;—while authority is paramount, and truth is received traditionally, and the conscience is still quick and powerful, as compared with after years;—that is to say, in childhood. This subject is one of very deep interest. If any of our readers wish to pursue it, they will find the whole matter treated with great ability in "THE CRUCIBLE; OR, TESTS OF A REGENERATE STATE;" by the Rev. J. A. Goodhue; a volume whose careful study would be most beneficial, as we conceive, to the whole religious community.

What if it be a mere passage at arms between a minister

and an intelligent hearer; exciting mutual respect and admiration:—on the part of the preacher, that his hearer is so intellectual and philosophic, and, withal, so ready to listen to his reasonings; and, on the part of the hearer, that his minister is so appreciative, and so scholarly in replying to what he plumes himself on his cleverness in suggesting. How much good has been done, in that case, on one side or on the other? We greatly fear that the whole effect lies directly against the chances of that man's conversion. Indeed, it appears to us abundantly plain that the first step in the direction of his submission to God, must be of a widely different character. Nor are we at all sanguine as to the conversion, by any means, of men who have surrendered themselves to the perverse and tortuous guidance of the speculative understanding. It is a most dangerous experiment, or rather it seems to us to furnish strong presumptive evidence of having already passed the point beyond which God will seldom go to bring a man back. Even in such a case, however, preaching to the conscience is by no means in vain; since one part of the grand purpose for which the Christian ministry was instituted is, to restrain the wickedness of men whom God does not design to save; so that the world may be tolerable for the elect, and, lest, through the superabounding of iniquity, *they* should fall away. This binding of Satan is effected only by flashing God's naked truth into the conscience.

How directly, and with what a regal authority, the Bible brings the great facts of God and his law, sin and its condemnation, Christ and his redemption, death and the judgment, home to every man, of every race and nation,—Jew or Gentile, Greek or Barbarian, wise or unwise. "All have sinned and come short of the glory of God." "Now commandeth he all men everywhere to repent." "He that believeth shall be saved, but he that believeth not shall be damned." In these brief pregnant sayings all is comprehended; and let it be considered whether, in the face of these grand and overwhelming appeals, all that the speculative understanding can suggest in a thousand years is not the most pitiful drivelling—"hollow poverty and emptiness."

How far we have drifted in this untoward direction is matter for grave inquiry. It is too early to have forgotten what was

the great peculiarity of the extensive revival of 1858. That there was a characteristic absence of deep conviction of sin, was the occasion of universal remark, and no small perplexity and debate. Is any other explanation required save the obvious fact that, to a very great extent, it was a work wrought in the speculative understanding, rather than in the conscience? The result was inevitable. Conversion through the understanding is not the work of the Holy Spirit. It needs no deep self-abasement for sin, — admits none. Nor can ten thousand such conversions yield the very smallest fruits of spiritual life. Self-righteousness and spiritual pride are the legitimate fruits. When the Spirit of God comes, it is to do, always and everywhere, substantially the same work, — to convince of sin; and that work is done, in every instance, — where alone it can be done in any instance, — in the conscience.

The subject is vital. It involves the true Scriptural character of the pulpit, and the spiritual life of the churches. Paul and the mocking Grecians of Areopagus were not farther asunder than are — really and ultimately — the two classes of preachers we have been considering; — as inevitable tendencies and ultimate results are even now demonstrating, on our right hand and on our left. Let the churches look to it, for it is peculiarly their concern. If the Schools of the Prophets, — recreant to their high responsibility, and incompetent to train *preachers*, who shall have skill to shoot the arrows of the Almighty, with sure and unerring aim, into the conscience of men, — make it their grand vocation to send forth rhetoricians and dialectical experts, you may just as well write on their walls at once that fatal word which tells to every passer-by that the glory is departed.

Philosophy is good, and rhetoric is good. Every faculty of the human mind hath its appropriate place and ministry, for the glory of Jesus Christ, and the enlargement of his kingdom on the earth. But whoso will prove the divine power of the Christian pulpit, as it was proved by Jonathan Edwards, and Whitefield, and Paul, or at least follow on in their footsteps, must take for his motto Paul's own words, "Therefore, seeing we have this ministry, as we have received mercy, we faint not; but have renounced the hidden things of dishonesty, not

walking in craftiness, nor handling the word of God deceitfully, but by manifestation of the truth commending ourselves to every man's conscience in the sight of God." (2 Cor. iv. 1, 2.)

The best learning of all for this high calling, — and absolutely indispensable, — is that which comes, not of the Schools, but of the teaching of God's Spirit. If we cannot have both, give us, by all means, the latter, — fishermen of Galilee, tinkers and cobblers, — in preference to the highest culture of Greek and Rabbi, so that what the great John Calvin noted with sorrow as an occasional fact in his day, become not the leading characteristic of our own; "We see even at this day some, even of those who profess the Gospel, who would rather be esteemed subtile than sincere, and sublime rather than solid, while in the mean time all their refinement is mere childishness."

---

## ARTICLE II.

### ONE OF TENNYSON'S POEMS.

OUR modesty is not affected. A critique of the Laureate as a composite unity would put us under bonds for a tribute to "Riverside" in a larger amount than we care just now to honor. A cabinet of gems is very beautiful to look upon; far more so than any single flashing jewel of them all: but then it is much more difficult to handle, in the way of a description, than that single precious stone. The crown jewels of London Tower are a magnificent *ensemble*; but it should hardly be charged to a visitor's want of appreciation, if, instead of essaying an account of their combined splendor, he prefers to write a few paragraphs to a friend concerning good Edward the Confessor's staff of beaten gold, or the baptismal salt-cellar of the same generous metal. Very like to this is our mood regarding this elegant little volume in purple covers, to the contents of which "Alfred Tennyson" asserts proprietorship, and from near the middle of which we cull a few pages for a brief review.

"Locksley Hall" is the birth, if not of a rarer genius, yet of a riper culture and a more vigorous purpose than the brief "swallow flights of song" which precede it, the delicate word-finishings of which reminds one of the perfect chiselling, *ad unguem*, of the smaller statues of the old masters; as if this exquisite verbal beauty were the accomplished author's main ambition. While others of them slumber in the delicious Indian-summer haziness of the shore where the "Lotos-Eaters" moored their bark:—

"In the afternoon they came unto a land  
In which it seemed always afternoon.  
All round the coast the languid air did swoon,  
Breathing like one that hath a weary dream."

One begins to feel, in turning these earlier, gilt-edged leaves, that a cataract before long in the mellifluous stream of music would be a pleasant relief; possibly to wonder if the smooth-voiced lute could give a really stirring note. There would indeed be no occasion of such wonder, if the reader should commence at the terminus of the book, and wend his way backward, as we have known some abnormally constituted persons commonly to do in a fragmentary work like this. The

"Half a league, half a league,  
Half a league onward;  
All in the valley of death  
Rode the six hundred"—

would sufficiently dissipate that doubt: or, what it might fail thus to do would find a full enough completion amidst the actually tremendous battle-dashes of the martial "Maud." No one, too, who has thoroughly sounded the solemn, dirge-like prophesyings of that peerless threnody "In Memoriam," will question whether Tennyson's muse is equal to the grasp of the most subtle and weighty poetic themes. But these, with the strong-minded "Princess" as well, are after-revelations. Nor is it to be supposed that the most of readers pursue any such crab-like course as just now intimated. We, at any rate, do not. We like to begin at the beginning, title-page, preface, chapter first, and so on. We take a volume like this as indicating the mental growth of its author,—youth, manhood, age; spring, summer, autumn; and peruse its successive accretions

as we count the rings on an oak to find how old it is. A lad has been piping on his Tityrean reed, with now and then the interlude of a graver measure; but now a man puts the trumpet to his lips to wind a clear, bold blast. The sound is inspiring, as the first strain sings freely forth —

“Comrades, leave me here a little, while as yet 'tis early morn;  
Leave me here, and when you want me, sound upon the bugle-horn.”

A man of autumnal presence and experience — a ward of Locksley Hall — finds himself, after years of absence, at the old, ancestral homestead; and parting awhile from his companions, recalls the memories, and recites the story, of a saddened but not a dispirited or a defeated life. It is a simple and common enough tale; but seldom has it been put into words of more pathetic eloquence, of more burning indignation, while here and there a trenchant irony flashes along the lines, cutting through and through the hollowness of a heartless, fustian civilization. It is not a private quarrel that is rehearsed; but the protest and the complaint of honest souls against a style of existence which is as false as it is pretentious, and which is no more the exclusive growth of an aristocratic soil than is any other sort of fungus-plant.

No poet has shown a more admirable skill in adapting the rhythm to the theme, be this what it may; of which this poem is a more than usually fine instance. Following an unerring instinct of modulation, he dashes off upon this outburst of passionate reminiscence and stern resolve, in a wild, galloping trochaic stanza which he manages with the ease of a thorough master. The hero of the story is a native of the East, where his father fell in battle; and the hot blood of that tropic-clime —

“Deep in yonder shining Orient where my life began to beat” —

courses through the verse which springs from his fevered soul, with a jet-like bound. Familiar objects start up old feelings and scenes.

“Here about the beach I wandered, nourishing a youth sublime,  
With the fairy tales of science, and the long result of Time;

“When the centuries behind me like a fruitful land reposed;  
When I clung to all the present, for the promise that it closed:

“When I dipt into the future far as human eye could see;  
Saw the vision of the world, and all the wonder that would be.”

The flush of his boy-life softens the tone of his spirit, and the crust around his heart melts again into the tenderer mood of that fresh morning of each new-comer's being.

"In the Spring a fuller crimson comes upon the robin's breast;  
In the Spring the wanton lapwing gets himself another crest;

"In the Spring a lovelier iris changes on the burnished dove;  
In the Spring a young man's fancy lightly turns to thoughts of love."

Nothing more natural. Writers set themselves to a very unpromising task who insist on recasting dramatic and imaginative literature generally in the moulds of some other regnant force than that of the universal passion. And simply for this reason, that in one or another form love rules the world; and the creations of genius must conform to the real, to take a permanent hold of the mind. A true love-story is the truest thing in nature. A counterfeit (and the number of these is like the grasshoppers in a newly-mown meadow) is an unmitigated nuisance. There are other great tides in the human heart; but this of the vernal equinox is the greatest. This master-affection will still assert its rights to supreme recognition, in spite of Attic fate and the would-be cynic of Monkbarrow. Our poet's touch is delicate; he only lifts a corner of the blushing curtain:—

"Then her cheek was pale and thinner than should be for one so young;  
And her eyes on all my motions with a mute observance hung.

"And I said, 'My cousin Amy, speak, and speak the truth to me;  
Trust me, Cousin, all the current of my being sets to thee.'"

The suit is favored, and with seeming sincerity. Warm and glowing words tell the strange joyousness of a virgin manhood in the assurance of this conquest of smiles and tears.

"Love took up the glass of Time, and turned it in his glowing hands;  
Every moment, lightly shaken, ran itself in golden sands.

"Love took up the harp of Life, and smote on all the chords with might;  
Smote the chord of Self, that, trembling, passed in music out of sight."

If the transfusion of one's-self into that of another which constitutes the inexplicable mystery of love has ever been more gracefully or accurately expressed than in this last line, we are at a loss where to turn to it. Pity it should not have been lavished upon a worthier object. "Cousin Amy" is not faithful to her vows. A rich, boorish nobody of a miserly father's



friend wins upon her ambitious hopes, and, with the paternal threat to help him, makes a prize of her. Now the verse wakes up to a terrible denunciation of this hollow, bargaining consenting to the conventional demands of place and pride. She has elected her destiny, sacrificing every loftier, dearer interest to position. The penalty is fearful. There is no escaping it. She has linked herself to a lump of coarse, heavy clay: and as it cannot rise to her intellectual and emotional level, she must subside to its.

"As the husband is the wife is; thou art mated with a clown,  
And the grossness of his nature will have weight to drag thee down.

"He will hold thee, when his passion shall have spent its novel force,  
Something better than his dog, a little dearer than his horse.

"What is this? his eyes are heavy: think not they are glazed with wine.  
Go to him: it is thy duty: kiss him: take his hand in thine.

"It may be my lord is weary, that his brain is overwrought;  
Soothe him with thy finer fancies, touch him with thy lighter thought.

"He will answer to the purpose, easy things to understand—  
Better thou wert dead before me, tho' I slew thee with my hand."

No overcolored picture this of the saddest of all sad things. But the poet lays the blame of it not so much at its unhappy victim's feet as upon the perverted opinions of society which sanction and too often command this sacrilege. Many a malediction has fallen on a less deserving offender.

"Cursed be the social wants that sin against the strength of youth!  
Cursed be the social lies that warp us from the living truth!

"Cursed be the sickly forms that err from honest Nature's rule!  
Cursed be the gold that gilds the straightened forehead of the fool!"

The painting is of the darkest shading—a Rembrandt; and but for its thorough harmony and truthfulness, a Salvator Rosa, in its stormy wrath.

"Like a dog he hunts in dreams, and thou art staring at the wall,  
Where the dying night-lamp flickers, and the shadows rise and fall.

"Then a hand shall pass before thee, pointing to his drunken sleep,  
To thy widowed marriage-pillows, to the tears that thou wilt weep.

"Thou shalt hear the 'Never, never,' whispered by the phantom years,  
And a song from out the distance in the ringing of thine ears.

"And an eye shall vex thee, looking ancient kindness on thy pain,  
Turn thee, turn thee on thy pillow; get thee to thy rest again:"



— a rest that may gather some solace in the cares and fondness of maternity relieving a little the aching emptiness within ; but such a doom is beyond any natural redemption from the fatality of the one great mistake. Its nearest approach to it is to settle yet lower down to the stolid practicality of its yoke-fellow, to harden what is left of one's heart into a millstone which shall at least grind out the grists of a dull and venal utility. So our poet leaves this part of his theme, with a withering sarcasm of contempt.

We pause a moment to consider. The topic is one of a close home-interest. We hope the numerous "good books" which have latterly been spun out from kindly hearts and prudent heads on the forming and management of domestic relationships will do something to abate the evil of misassorted natures. It is melancholy that the most sacred temple of human loves should ever be turned into a prison-house of worse than Pharaonic bondage. Yet, with every precaution against it, the misery of this error will doubtless enter many another disappointed soul, turning its anticipated parterre of summer flowers into a bed of wormwood. The question is certainly worth asking, whether nothing but the bitter herbs can grow even there ? Perhaps not, under a merely natural culture. But the utterly disappointed and seemingly ruined Madame Guyon found, amid this very wreck of earthly expectations, and as the immediate product of it, a wondrously potent charm for the heartache of her sorrows, in a simple and childlike trust in God and communion with the Spirit of Christ, which, with much of morbid sensibility in it, did give her a real victory over this formidable adversary. We cannot but wish that just here our author had pressed a drop of that *Christi consolatio* into his cup of myrrh and aloes, which he has mingled so freely in the precious chalice of the "In Memoriam" — even at the risk of marring the artistic unity of his poem.

But there is no such toning down the sentiment ; and we push on with our hard rider, in the rush of impulses and sensations which whirls him away from his betrayed confidence into other excitements.

"Am I mad, that I should cherish that which bears but bitter fruit ?  
I will pluck it from my bosom, tho' my heart be at the root."

— a resolve easier made than kept. But a brave spirit will fight for its life against the demon of Despond. It is a little difficult, however, to find just where to strike for another conquest in an age like this. Gold holds the keys of the gateways of success ; gold bars the doors up to which the clamorous crowds are thronging.

" I had been content to perish, falling on the foeman's ground,  
When the ranks are rolled in vapor, and the winds are laid with sound.

" But the jingling of the guinea helps the hurt that Honor feels,  
And the nations do but murmur, snarling at each other's heels.

" Can I but relive in sadness ? I will turn that earlier page.  
Hide me from my deep emotion, oh thou wondrous Mother-Age !

" Make me feel the wild pulsation that I felt before the strife,  
When I heard my days before me, and the tumult of my life ;

" Heard the heavens fill with shouting, and there rained a ghastly dew  
From the nations' airy navies grappling in the central blue ;

" Far along the world-wide whisper of the south-wind rushing warm,  
With the standards of the peoples plunging thro' the thunder-storm ;

" Till the war-drum throbbed no longer, and the battle-flags were furled  
In the Parliament of man, the Federation of the world.

" So I triumphed "

— Yet not very satisfactorily it would appear — an imaginary more than a real victory.

" So I triumphed, ere my passion sweeping thro' me left me dry,  
Left me with the palsied heart, and left me with the jaundiced eye, —

" Eye, to which all order festers, all things here are out of joint,  
Science moves, but slowly, slowly, creeping on from point to point : "

" Slowly comes a hungry people, as a lion, creeping nigher,  
Glares at one that nods and winks behind a slowly-dying fire."

— a picture of the days of the Bastille and the Sansculotte which, in two lines, gives us the contents of Carlyle's two volumes of *France-run-mad*. This is the power which stamps genius with its royal mark. — Tennyson does not seem to be very sanguine concerning the intellectual millennium of which Mr. Buckle is prophesying so oracularly. We judge him not to be a disciple of that inflated school. While it is true enough that " the thoughts of men are widened with the

process of the suns," none but an incurable egotist will dissent from the poet's confession ;

" Knowledge comes, but Wisdom lingers, and he bears a laden breast,  
Full of sad experience moving toward the stillness of his rest."

But the merry bugle-note of his comrades calls our solitary, stirring again the slackening fires of his tropical nature in which this transient philosophic mood is burned up like a handful of dry leaves. He spurns the trammels of civilization, and pants for the freedom of the wild life of far-off shores "at the gateway of the day," where no European trader chaffers or flag floats amid the heavy-blossomed bowers and heavy-fruited trees of

" Summer isles of Eden lying in dark-purple spheres of sea."

The picture has a momentary fascination. Those "dark-purple spheres of sea" are enough to tempt almost any one to fly away in quest of their murmuring waves.

" There methinks would be enjoyment more than in this march of mind,  
In the steamship, in the railway, in the thoughts that shake mankind.

" There the passions, cramped no longer, shall have scope and breathing-space ;  
I will take some savage woman, she shall rear my dusky race.

" Iron-jointed, supple-sinewed, they shall dive, and they shall run,  
Catch the wild goat by the hair, and hurl their lances in the sun ;

" Whistle back the parrot's call, and leap the rainbows of the brooks,  
Not with blinded eyesight poring over miserable books."

It will not do. The mere statement of the question explodes it as preposterous. Even Rousseau was not crazed enough to practise on his own creed of a paradisiacal savageism. It is too false for a second thought. Bad as the Fifth Avenue may be, the etiquette and morals of Dahomey and the Marquesas are beyond comparison worse.

" Fool, again the dream, the fancy ! but I *know* my words are wild,  
But I count the gray barbarian lower than the Christian child.

" I, to herd with narrow foreheads, vacant of our glorious gains,  
Like a beast with lower pleasures, like a beast with lower pains !

" Mated with a squalid savage — what to me were sun or clime ?  
I the heir of all the ages, in the foremost files of time." —

—a capital prescription to cure any of our Byronic young misanthropes whom some South-sea Melville may have inoculated with the Typee and Omoo fever. Fish-oil toilets and cannibal cuisines to those of strong enough stomachs. We prefer to *gang anither gate*, albeit our guide just now is rather heady in his on-goings, and arrives at a decidedly abrupt and somewhat dramatic upshot of his travels, quite *a la* Ravenswood of the “large sable feather.”

“Not in vain the distance beacons. Forward, forward let us range.  
Let the great world spin forever down the ringing grooves of change.

“Thro’ the shadow of the globe we sweep into the younger day ;  
Better fifty years of Europe than a cycle of Cathay.

“Mother-age, (for mine I knew not,) help me as when life begun :  
Rift the hills, and roll the waters, flash the lightnings, weigh the sun.

“O, I see the crescent promise of my spirit hath not set,  
Ancient founts of inspiration well thro’ all my fancy yet.

“Howsoever these things be, a long farewell to Locksley Hall !  
Now for me the woods may wither, now for me the roof-tree fall.

“Comes a vapor from the margin, blackening over heath andholt,  
Cramming all the blast before it, in its breast a thunderbolt.

“Let it fall on Locksley Hall, with rain or hail, or fire or snow :  
For the mighty wind arises, roaring seaward, and I go.”

We have not thought it worth while to stay the progress of the poet in order to point out the many beauties of his verse, the aptness and force of his transitions, and other fine points of his work. The reader will not have missed these if open to the charms of such writing. In the full version there are many more of them than we could cull into this bouquet. Competent criticism across the water pronounces this poem one of the best specimens of this class of composition in the language. The passions which surge through it are surging through countless dissatisfied souls in this fast and furious age of ours. It is a most natural expression of one and a very common phase of social disappointment, while, as Augustine so truthfully confessed for himself and for thousands since as well, we wander “further and further from Thee, into more and more fruitless seed-plots of sorrow, with a proud dejectedness, and a restless weariness.” And the remedy which it gives its victim is the

best which nature alone can supply the spirit to help it bear its infirmities and heal its sicknesses. What we want — and this only — is that sweet vision of Faith kneeling before the Cross along the dim pathway, which Palmer has hung up in our memory on the pure marble, to be a joy forever; and which Tennyson himself has elsewhere sung in that noble invocation beginning —

“Strong Son of God, immortal Love!”

---

### ARTICLE III.

#### IMMORTALITY AND ANNIHILATION.

*Debt and Grace, as related to the Doctrine of Future Life.*

By C. F. HUDSON. 1857-1861. pp. 497.

*Christ our Life. The Scriptural Argument for Immortality through Christ alone.* By C. F. HUDSON. 1861. pp. 168.

*La Mort n'est qu'un Sommeil Éternel.* Pere la Chaise. 1793.

PRYING up foundations is a favorite work of the present generation. But this always involves the question whether the stone shall move or the lever be broken. We are quite sure that it will take a tougher bar of iron than has yet been forged to loosen the great rock of the Immortality of the Soul and topple it over into the black and bottomless abyss of Annihilation. We hold this assurance as well concerning the just now vigorously advocated assumption of the limited existence of the unforgiven wicked, as against the general affirmation of the materialists, — that all human spirits are perishable like the brutes.

That this topic should need re-arguing almost compels one to ask, if there is anything settled under the sun? The dream and the study of mankind since the creation, it has evolved in its defence a large variety of reasons. These have moulded themselves to the peculiar characteristics of their authors; now exhibiting the deductions of a severe logic, and now taking on

the softer hues of sentiment, and giving utterance to the impassioned demands of the moral consciousness for a ceaseless life. To many, the intuitional persuasion is sufficient: — "We know that the soul is immortal, as we know there is a God." Can any one affirm the contrary, with the same intelligent, devout, self-vindicating positiveness?

What is a human soul? An elementary, uncomposed, undecomposable unity or entity. Simple substances are permanent. Destruction is only a relative change in compounds, merging one form of combination into another. The cessation of being is merely apparent, not real. The elementary parts sustain no loss amid whatever transmutations. Thus, in the combustion of wood or coal, in the evaporation of fluids, and the like, a specific organization disappears; but its components undergo no extinction. This does not prove (as we are told) that atoms must have always existed. "He who made all things is God" — the sole "*from* everlasting." Nor does this demand their necessary indestructibility. That depends on their Maker's ordination. "Un-creation" is as possible as creation, if God wills. But what is the law which He has established here? That is just now the inquiry; and we are stating its answer.

Man's spiritual nature is a simple unit. We infer this from its resemblance to God's being. That is the perfect type of uncreated simplicity. Hence the old theological formula — that "God is the simplest being in the universe." Ours is the finite form of the same quality. Not that in both there are not blended many different attributes. The divine and the human soul have each the powers of intellection, sympathy, conscience; each is a marvellous collection of susceptibilities and capabilities. Yet neither was ever collected as a bouquet is made up from a flower garden, or a casket of jewels from a lapidary's shop. Gold is a simple substance reducible to nothing more radical; yet any given piece of it has its various description of weight, color, shape. The soul is one, though of many properties. Certain things belong to it, are latent in it, came with it into being, constitute its identity. It comes an original creation from God's hand entire in its natural, though as yet undeveloped capacities. It enters into no union with the body which disturbs its condition as thus defined. It works through the

medium of its muscular and nervous habitation, but it is separate from this and can act without it. Flesh and spirit are two wholly distinct facts. Said the prophet Elijah; "O Lord my God, I pray thee, let this child's soul come into him again; and the soul of the child came into him again, and he revived." Disunited awhile, the entireness of neither was marred. Death consequently does not touch the immaterial portion of us with any disorganizing, destroying force. This passes its crucible as silver through the fire, unconverted into aught else, unreduced to nought. "The dust returns to the dust as it was, and the spirit unto God who gave it." So we find the simple, elementary quality of the mind discriminated and protected, as a permanent essence. But we are at a loss to discover why this obliges us to "welcome all living creatures to immortal life." The immortality is not in the necessity of the case, but in the pleasure of God, even with regard to the highest forms of spiritual being. It is not of "debt" in any sense; and here, once for all, we object to the antithesis in the title of one of these volumes, as conveying an untrue conception of the common faith. This imposes no such claim on the Creator. Suppose that the brutal nature is an exception to the law of living organisms; and for this reason — that it is an irrational, irresponsible nature constitutionally, and therefore devoid of any powers or adaptations for the uses of immortality? We give ourselves no trouble about the futurity of the brutes which perish. We do not at all concede that, "if this argument is conclusive, it must be granted that whatever has felt and acted spontaneously must live again and forever." Brutal spontaneity is not spiritual rationality. Were the issue, however, this — to accept the future duration of the brute mind (if so it can be termed) or to let go our faith in the immortality of our entire race; we should promptly set to work to stretch our belief over the whole of the required ground, rather than to contract it to the meagre and (we must add) the miserable narrowness of the annihilation-creed. But no such issue is legitimately presented. The *automatic* theory of the inferior animal life, indorsed by eminent physiologists, would save us from this alternative; and certainly, as an hypothesis, this offers as good a solution of the problem in that direction as the annihilationists can demand.

But words enough have been expended upon this captious objection.

The powers and adaptations of the soul point unmistakably to the perpetuity of its being. The author of the "Night Thoughts" has not put this fact more strongly than the general consciousness will justify :

"Who reads his bosom reads immortal life :  
Or Nature there, imposing on her sons,  
Has written fables ; man was made a lie."

We are able to comprehend the true, the perfect, the universal, the everlasting. Is the idea nothing better than the "somewhat Gnostic" of a recent criticism — that intelligences of an order high enough to grasp such truths must have, in their native organism, a cast of spirit which answers to the mould of these grand and limitless conceptions, thus partially at least appropriated as its own ? We just drop the query, in passing. An old thought is not *therefore* false. But the argument has other and more popular bearings.

Besides the capacity which we have to debate this great question of our own endless existence, we find within ourselves a preconfigured fitness for its possession, as an original law of our being. This is our position — that under the constitution given to humanity by the Creator, and irrespective of its moral character and destiny, immortality as much inheres in it as does conscience or reason or memory. It is sensible of an elastic force pressing outwardly against enclosing barriers. It feels a vital energy which needs only a freer condition of life to exchange its thus far infantile steps for the tread of a giant, the soarings of a seraph. It is like a princely ship with her sails taken aback and fluttering in a contrary wind. She rocks on the wave, nor can she leave her port for distant seas though thoroughly equipped for her ocean voyage. But when the breezes favor, her white canvas will swell to their breath, and bending to the pressure, she will glide swiftly upon her watery path. Shall we say that yon vessel, freighted with costly merchandise, manned with an active crew, with every rope and sail and spar in place, with charts and compass on board, but fast



held to the bottom by a foul anchor, was built and rigged just for this purpose — to swing there like a buoy over a sunken rock? Then why this outlay and this outfit? These tell that her business is across the deep on worldwide courses; that she was not made to ride and rot within sight of the spot where she was launched. Adaptation predicts employment. But not more positively in material than in spiritual constructions. What the soul is conscious that it can be and do, it will have an opportunity to essay; it will fail of, if it fails, by no natural incapacitation. "Wherefore," asks Jean Paul, "were we placed upon this ball of earth, creatures with light wings; if, instead of soaring with our wings of ether, we are to fall back into the earth-clods of our birth?"

Man finds within himself faculties of comprehension, attachment, emotion, passion, which here only begin to put forth the strength which is in them. These are the occasions of numberless desires which crave their gratification in ranges of knowledge not now to be well explored; in a depth and permanency and perfectness of sympathy and love here never to be realized. What is more universally characteristic of our race than the dissatisfaction and the regrets of defeated endeavors, blighted hopes? The human heart is as restless as an imprisoned bird. Especially does it sigh over the fruitlessness of its purer aspirations, its nobler wishes. It is not that, under these impulses, it would have a more complete possession of any merely earthly good. This, however abundant, is not what the spirit most craves that it may be truly blest. Its deeper wants covet not more of this world, but the experience of something radically unlike these worldly gifts. The animal in us has its content in appropriate enjoyments. The soul is not content with that food. It needs and asks a different. For, as Richter writes:

"The eternal hunger in man, the unappeased longing of his heart demands not richer but other nourishment. Thus our indigence is not satisfied with the quantity, but depends on the species of the food. The imagination can paint itself a degree of satisfaction, but it is not happy in the accumulation of all possessions, if they are other than truth, beauty, and goodness."

The observation is morally and intellectually just — that this

world within us demands and manifests a second, without (that is beyond) us. *That* is the real complement of *this*, by the logic of feeling no more than of understanding. Humanity responds to the generous, the fearful outburst of a manly indignation :—

“I cannot tell thee how painful, how monstrous and horrible the thought of an annihilating death, of an eternal grave for this noble form, in all its spiritual loveliness, now appeared to me ! If that be so, and his soul that had never been happy would pass from its prison upon the earth, to its hollow prison under it. Men often bear their errors, as their truths, about in words, and not in feeling ; but let the believer in annihilation place before him, instead of a life of sixty years, one of sixty minutes ; then let him look upon the face of a beloved being, or upon a noble and wise man, as upon an aimless, hour-long appearance ; as a thin shadow that melts into light, and leaves no trace. Can he bear the thought ? No. The supposition of imperishableness is always with him. Else there would hang ever before his soul, as before Mohammed’s, in the fairest sky, a black cloud ; and as Cain upon the earth, an eternal fear would pursue him. . . . When so many hours are hours of mourning, so many fields battle-fields, so many cheeks are pale ; when we pass before so many eyes red with weeping or closed in death ; oh, can the grave . . . be the last, swallowing, unyielding whirlpool ? . . . From the formless earth worm up to the beaming human countenance ; from the chaos of the first day up to the present age of the world ; from the first faint motion of the heart to its full, bold throbbing in the breast of manhood ; the invisible hand of God leads, protects, and nourishes the inward being, the nursling of the outward ; educates, and polishes, and makes it beautiful — and wherefore ? That when it stands as a demi-god in the midst of the ruins of the temple of the body, upright and elevated, the blow of death may prostrate it forever ; that nothing shall remain from the corpse-veiled, the mourning and mantled, immeasurable universe, but the eternally sowing, never harvesting solitary spirit of the world ! — one eternity looking despairingly at the other ; and in the whole spiritual creation, no end, no aim !” (Jean Paul Frederic Richter’s *Kampaner Thal*.)

Protests like this against the notion of the total or partial destruction of souls are all the more true because they instinctively take on the dress of passionate poetic expression. But (say the partialists) the evangelical doctrine concerning the

impenitent dead forbids the realizing, in their case, of any of these sighings for a future and greater good: "when a wicked man dieth, his expectation," if not himself, "shall perish" — so teaches the Holy Word; why not then excise his hopes in the one way as well as the other? Because the law of their being forbids it. We affirm it as the common sense of men. The burden of proof consequently lies with the denier. He impugns the verdict of the *consensus humanus*; and he must prove his negative. We shall see if he has done it. The question is not whether the one or the other destiny is more or less undesirable in the election of an utterly reprobate sinner; but which is the fact? We are told that sin is mere weakness — so feeble a thing that all it needs is to be let alone to die out, as a dead and decaying tree. It is nothing more than a minus quantity; give it time enough and it will literally be "*non est inventum*." If sin be eternal (say they) then sin is godship itself. Therefore God must let a countless number of his intelligent offspring absolutely cease to be, or there will be "more gods than one." Further — "guilt ceases to be degrading when it becomes immortal." That is, a capacity to suffer forever is Divine — a power of endless rebellion is too splendid a rivalry of the supreme majesty to be allowed to imperil the glory of Jehovah! (D. and G. p. 16.) We are amazed at this writing. Must God then preserve his rightful honors, his just supremacy, by reënacting the old myth of the child-devouring Saturn? This reasoning is vastly weaker than the smallest sin it would thus dilute into nonentity. It is enough to deny as categorically as, on the other side, it is asserted, and affirm that, sin being intrinsically base and vile, eternal sinning can be neither dignified nor divine in any being or in any world. One hoary rebel, at least, who has been confined "in chains under darkness" for more centuries than our earth has seen since Eden, has fallen away so little in the debilitation of this sort of self-consumption, that (we know not how many ages hence) he will still have devilish venom and vigor sufficient to come down with great wrath upon the holy, even as he has been doing ever since he lifted his black flag of rebellion. (Rev. xii. 12, and xx. 7, 8.) There is just as little need for the Most High to quench out the life of his enemies in

order to sustain the doctrine of his own unity, as there is evidence that wickedness will rot itself away into a final and total nihility.

We take our stand at the threshold of the revealed record of our race and maintain that the whole projection of a rational being assumes the fact of its inherent immortality. Else, what means it that God created man in his own image and likeness? God will never cease to be: and that were surely a copy of him too unlike to be other than a pitiable failure which should leave out this endlessness of existence. Nor was it a "gracious ability" to be immortal, if doing something besides the act of living. We look upon that sinless pair in Eden, and as they there converse with each other and with Deity in pure affections and aspiring thoughts, we mark the stamp of an actual not a possible eternity upon their brow as legibly as though its letters were traced there by the Creator's finger. It strikes us as a very lame *non sequitur* to affirm, that, "the creation in the divine likeness no more proves man's absolute immortality than it proves his eternal preëxistence, his omniscience, or his possession of any other divine attribute." (D. and G. p. 166.) Of course the phrase, "absolute immortality," is here used of an existence to come, not past. Now, the formula — "in the image of God made He him" — must signify as much as this; that, so far as the finite can be resembled to the Infinite, so far in all respects man was conformed to God. The creature could not have been eternally preëxistent, therefore he was not. He could not have been omniscient, or otherwise divinely endowed, simply because he was not Divine but human; therefore he was not. But he could, by God's high decree, be made as immortal prospectively, as the Eternal himself. Therefore he was in all the generations of his posterity; because God's life will never cease, and *the man*, whom God put at the fountain head of the coming millions, was fashioned as near the original pattern as was possible to the originated soul. Otherwise, how was he made but "a little lower than the angels"? The Hebrew gives it much stronger — וַתַּחַפְּרֵהוּ מֵעַט מֵאֱלֹהִים, (Ps. viii. 6,) thou hast caused him to want but little of God; i. e. thou hast made him but little lower than God; (cf. Robinson's Gesenius,) — which (says Alexander) is predicated not of the indi-

vidual but of the race. If constitutionally we are perishable, neither we nor that first parent of mankind could be thus described as crowned with angelic, with almost divine, honor and glory.

We regard the Mosaic statement as set at the commencement of the only authentic history of our origin, in order to interpret all subsequent references to this subject. It gives a definition of the words — perdition, death, destruction, perishing — as applied to the human spirit. It decides what these can *not* signify. Sometimes it seems well-nigh incredible that the Chief Magistrate of the universe should condescend to inquire so minutely, to look so tenderly, after our welfare, even though we are heirs of an endless being. Reading the inspired records of his administration of our race, we pause and ask in wonder; “what is man that thou art mindful of him, or the son of man that thou visitest him”? when we know that the true answer is — “man is Thine own deathless child.” But take away the “deathless,” and the question rebounds upon its propounder like a reacting blow of stunning force. Dig a grave for any, the most worthless human soul, and then try to persuade men’s reasons or their hearts to believe the doctrine of divine Providence governing human history; to believe the gospel of Redeeming love sent forth to rescue less than a spirit immortal in its own nature, however lost by rebellion. The very glory of Christ’s remedial work is this — that it saves from guilt and hell those who else must forever suffer all the woes of an everlasting separation from a holy and loving God. It is the only salvation from guilt. But here we are informed of another door of escape — even a sure retreat into the unconscious, unsuffering embrace of an absolute and everlasting oblivion; a draught of Lethean waters which shall put to rest every pang of remorse, in the insensibility of the dull clod. Is there such an anæsthetic within the reach of God’s adversaries as this *aut beatus, aut nihil*?

We are aware of no contradiction between this question and the general revulsion of the feelings from the thought of annihilation. Real and deep as this repugnance is, it is in the power of ungodly lusts to make even so revolting an offer acceptable in the dim hereafter as a quietus of the conscience.

Our fixed opinion is that this notion, if widely accepted, would prove to be well-nigh as tempting to sinful indulgence as is the promise of indiscriminate salvation to all mankind in the future state.

It is not a plausible, still less a proven position, that Christ died to give immortal existence to the soul, and not rather to restore to righteousness its already possessed immortality; and hence to assert that an endless existence always carries along with it the promise of an eternal salvation, as the specific and exclusive fruit of atoning mercy. This doctrine can neither be made out upon exegetical or theological grounds; and its appeal to history is scarcely worth a notice, in the way of argument, though rather curious in the way of chimerical speculation. It is brought forward as a theodicy, that is, a vindication of God, in the matter of the existence, treatment, and final adjudication of sin in his universe. And then the alleged demands of rectoral fairness, of benevolent justice here, are carried over to the exposition of the gospel statements of salvation and retribution. That justification of the ways of God to men, which a few years ago was sedulously attempted through the medium of a pre-adamic probation and fall of mankind, is now as toilsomely labored by this patent of the eventual expulsion of the tree of evil, branch and root. Sin is inherently perishable, and by its own gravitation, must subside into nonentity and oblivion. There is no natural or spiritual, in that there is no gracious life, in it or its perpetrators. This method of illuminating the mystery of evil and assuaging the agony of faith concerning it, more than any other, constrains the interrogatory — whether it had not been better to have set up no moral system at all, than to have thus created uncounted millions of men absolutely in vain! Is such a scheme to be successfully bastioned with fine-spun metaphysical reasonings to show that sin is not a necessary means of a greater good; that it is not wanted to illustrate the Divine justice, skill, holiness; that all these would have an adequate glory without the displays of God's love in Christ to a rebel world, and the eternal discriminations of his sovereign mercy therewith connected; that there can be a heaven of sufficient light and bliss without the background of a lurid and a quenchless hell? If these and other like points

should be granted to the debate, (which we do not, however, intend) how does it therefore follow that sin, once getting foothold in human wills and loves, that revolt, once thoroughly entrenching itself in a broken commandment, shall not go on repeating itself in successive deeds of transgression and shame, forever and ever? If guilt accumulated in this world could be proved to fall so far short of the dimensions of an infinite crime as not to deserve and demand an everlasting penalty; how does this determine that it will not punish itself in another life, and be justly punished there by God also, because of its then persistent holding out against the throne and law of the Almighty? Sin wherever committed, in the body or out of the body, worketh death. As heavenly holiness shall complete the saintliness and the blessedness of the earthly sanctification, so the yet more giant viciousness of the doomed in the "outer darkness," may finish the demerit and perpetuate the punishment of that state without limits. Are not the terrible words a prophecy of the exact condition of lost souls through endless ages — in that kingdom of eternal midnight; "And they gnawed their tongues for pain, and blasphemed the God of heaven because of their pains and their sores; *and repented not of their evil deeds.*" (Rev. xvi. 10.) What but this are the Devil and his angels now doing? And if doing it for six thousand years gone by, why may not they and all their confederates go on doing it, and suffering for it, evermore?

We regard the annihilation of the wicked as taking ground directly at issue with the Scripture doctrine of future punishment. This would, of course, weigh nothing with the rejectors of the ultimate authority of the Bible in matters of faith. Theodore Parker candidly confesses that it positively asserts our creed at this point; but then "our Theodore" always makes a Bible for himself, leaving out that "under world." Those, however, who go to our oracle for a last decision in these solemn inquiries may be expected to bow their pre-judgments to its arbitration. The pressure is obviously felt. This is shown in the very disproportionate space given to an investigation of the biblical views of the topic — one not lengthily chapter out of thirteen of otherwise miscellaneous discourses concerning it: and also in the following evasive treatment of the awkward difficulty: —



"It is hardly necessary to remind the reader that the question which we raise is not respecting the *duration* of future punishment, but respecting its *nature*. We are to show that exclusion from all life is a punishment, and that this is the revealed punishment of the lost. If it be so, then we may at once admit the words 'eternal,' 'everlasting,' and similar phrases, used to indicate the duration of the final doom, as denoting an absolute eternity; we shall waste no time in efforts to reduce their significance in the least." (Debt and Grace, p. 160.)

Nor will the author attempt any new modes of interpretation, but admits "that the obvious sense of words is *primâ facie* their true sense." Is not this a virtual surrender of the case? The punishment of rebellion against God is everlasting. Granted. What is its "nature"? Personal and conscious suffering is a part of it, by the instinctive verdict of mankind. And can this *nature* be evolved without taking account of the element of *duration*? The "duration" is essential to the "nature." A convict is sentenced to fifty years in the state-prison. The *term* of his incarceration as well as the *fact* makes up the burden of that judgment. Is an infliction for an hour or a minute the same thing intrinsically as for half a century, or forever? But what is the idea of endlessness as applied to the punishment of sinners? Certainly, that of continuance without termination. Continuance of what? Of nothing, if the soul lapses into non-existence. Grant that the annihilating stroke were a punishment of terrific magnitude. It cannot be a perpetual striking. There is a glaring impropriety in speaking of a cessation of all consciousness and life as a never-ceasing endurance of punishment, whether of inward remorse or of positive pains.

Space precludes a quotation of the Biblical representations on this subject. Readers of Scripture are aware how often the doom of the unrighteous is declared, under every form of literal and figurative language, to be endless without qualification. Pages might be filled with these texts, singly asserting this truth, or giving it in yet clearer force as contrasted with the perpetual bliss of the saints. Without consuming exegetical paper or patience, we are content to ask, if the obviously designed and commonly understood meaning of these texts will

allow, without a violent wrench, the fact of an absolute destruction of Satan and all unpardoned spirits? We set the uninspired paragraph above cited over against a single statement of Christ; "And these shall go away into everlasting punishment; but the righteous into life eternal" — and request it to be read once more in the light of this verse, as a test of its truth. That demands the sinner's "exclusion from all life" — existence — as "the revealed punishment of the lost." On the contrary, these strong words of Jesus put emphasis on the immortal prolongation of the doom they threaten, while the other class of terms used by the sacred writers concerning the wicked — destruction, death, shall perish, be cut off — has a competent interpretation in the fearful truth of a spiritual undoing and desolation without the affix of a literal extinguishment of the soul itself, whether at death or ages beyond it. There is no verbal, textual necessity for the dogma of annihilation. There is a verbal, textual necessity for just the antagonist doctrine, in the terms which the soul's Maker has employed to set forth its endlessness of penal sorrows if unsaved. In this channel of exposition, Scripture flows freely. In the other, it is a forced, a resisting stream, and comes to many a place where it must be canalised through very stubborn rock. We deem this sufficient to settle the controversy as a question of Revelation (and this it mainly must be;) far better for all practical purposes than to appeal to thick volumes of citations from grammars and lexicons and commentaries on either side, whether heterodox or orthodox. How next to everlastingly these can be drawn out, our bookshelves furnish fatiguing proof and illustration.

By the way, if such citations are not made with more of scholarly care and common fairness than not a few of those which make up this patch-work, they can be of small use to any one who wishes to know what the authorities would say. In some of these excerpts from Olshausen, Barnes, and other familiar authors, we have been much reminded of the besetting sin of our recent telegraph operators. It is hardly the right thing to make a witness affirm just what he does not intend to, through this art of putting asunder what the writer joined together. It is more fitting for a lawyer's special pleading than for a theological investigation.

The necessities of the annihilator are painful. His exegesis is often like dragging a tree top foremost. He now and then comes so near contradicting himself, that it amounts quite to this privilege of erratic, shall we add, unsettled mental action? Then, the thought skims off on a swallow-flight into a tenuous airiness, where it is impossible to grasp its shadowy form or spirit. Here is an instance of both. Encountering the fact of the "resurrection of the unjust" he writes:—

"It is hard to believe that they are raised up by a miracle that ends in their destruction, or that accomplishes nothing but a judgment which in this view must appear simply vindictive. If they have no immortality why are their slumbers disturbed?" (D. and G. p. 263.)

Wherefore, indeed? What then is the reply to this very sensible interrogatory? Something which we confess a want of perspicacity to see, even as a tree walking.

"Now the Glad Tidings of the Redemption, quickening and invigorating the soul with new life, may so far repair the injury done it in the Fall, that even the unbelieving who derive many benefits therefrom in this life, may not altogether perish in the bodily death." (D. and G. pp. 263, 264.)

Is this restorationism; or what is it—thus resuscitating to a partial or perfect animation the almost drowned in that devouring flood of stagnant oblivion? We can find no intelligible answer.

So far as the force of words extends, the position now taken holds substantially of that group of gospel representations which makes Christ the author of "eternal life." At the risk of being thought superficial or disrespectful (possibly both) we deem it enough to reply to "The Scriptural Argument for Immortality through Christ alone"—that this phrase "eternal life" does not necessarily embrace the idea of imparting the principle of a continued existence. It is, on the contrary, the common term for a regenerate and sanctified state, as "death" denotes the condition of an unregenerate transgressor. To name the authorities which are with us here would be to catalogue the chief guides in sacred philology. The life thus spoken of finds accordingly a valid signification in the securing to men, through Christ's

atonement and Spirit, a salvation from sin and woe. Eternal or everlasting life of which Jesus is the dispenser is an endless holiness and blessedness. This is his "unspeakable gift." To take the word *life* as signifying existence itself is neither grammatically demanded nor warranted. The relation of Christ to the fact of our eternal being is exactly taught us by the Apostle — that He "brought life and immortality *to light* through the Gospel." He republished an obscured and fading truth ; set it in an illumination where it could never more be eclipsed. He reaffirmed man's immortality, and disclosed therewith the only method of a holy and blessed life to those already endowed with this costliest of inheritances. "And this is life eternal, that they might know thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent." This experimental knowledge is the life thus eternal — an everlasting redemption, and reunion with God, from a doom of perpetual guilt and despair. Thus in Isaiah : — "By the knowledge of him shall my righteous servant justify many." Eternal justification is eternal life. So is "Christ our Life," beyond which sense no Scripture requires us to push its testimony.

There is another thought just here protruding. Christ's proffered recovery to life only becomes ours as we freely accept its grace. If then the boon of endless *being* inheres in this grace, we have the power and the responsibility of making ourselves immortal — of literally "creating a soul under the ribs of death." An act of choice in us breathes a never-dying spirit into a mere perishable mould of clay. This does indeed fulfil the tempting promise of the serpent to our first mother ; "ye shall be as gods" — investing us with truly deific functions. But again, the actually saved are virtually saved in the electing decree of God from before the foundation of the world. Can we avoid asking — whether their endowment with immortality dated at that pristine period, they thus being immortal from the first though not yet born or pardoned ; and did they then, consequently, immortalize themselves ? Or, is it at the moment of their regeneration that this gift is granted, so making the electing decree a very uninfluential transaction ? The author is not successful in clearing these problems. The theory which challenges our faith to its dismal embraces is responsible for

these queries, and for the palpable absurdities which they suggest.

Our intention was neither a detailed review of the treatises indicated under the title of this article, nor an exhaustive discussion of the subject in hand ; but rather a treatment of such prominent points of the doctrine of an endless life, by whomsoever and on whatever scale denied, as our limits might permit. We would ever handle a theme like this with proper seriousness, even when attempting to wring off the neck of fallacious and damaging errors. The denial of immortal being to a part alone is a less abhorrent idea than the promiscuous dying out or extinguishment of all human souls. Yet we regard the one as groundless as the other, and both to be utterly reprobated. It is strange to us that any one who knows what is the consciousness of a rational life should wish to throw into this "blooming world such an immeasurable grave-stone, that no time can lift." One would think that the most zealous advocate of that nightmare-fantasy must confess with the yielding Carlson, in the beautiful colloquy of Jean Paul ; "I can bear no annihilation but my own ! My *heart* is of your opinion ; my *head* will shortly follow."

---

#### ARTICLE IV.

##### THE PLACE OF ROMANCE IN LITERATURE.

It is the object of this paper to show the place held by Romance in the general field of Literature, to point out, as far as may be, its distinguishing characteristics, the elements in our human nature of which it is the representative, and which are therefore the ground of its popularity. We shall find, if we succeed, an element of Romance, potential or real, in each individual, not less than in the collective life of humanity ; the whole having the essential characteristics of the individual, only standing out in clearer view, and so becoming the proper object of scientific inquiry and investigation.

The name Romance was originally applied to the literature of the languages derived from the Latin or Roman languages, and continued to be applied to literature of a similar character in subsequent times. The present popular sense of the word, as the fanciful, the imaginary, the visionary, and especially as applied to the schemes and expectations of young persons, is a wholly derived sense. It is, however, not less important, as revealing the fundamental principles which this form of literature recognizes. They correspond, in our individual life, to that peculiar state of intellectual and moral life which prevailed in the latter part of the Middle Ages, and which found expression in Romance.

The most general division of Literature is into the literature of fact, and the literature of the imagination. To the first belong all works of history, science, and philosophy; to the second, all works of fiction, whether in prose or verse. Yet the distinction holds, in its strict sense, only on this wise. To the literature of fact belong only the simplest annals, narratives, historic records, and scientific observations; since the imagination enters largely into the construction of history, and has an important place in science and philosophy. In short, it comes into play the moment we pass beyond the pure outward fact and enter the sphere of ideas. It is essentially the organ of ideas, through which the scientific naturalist, like Owen, from a given part completes the whole of an organism no human eye has ever seen; or a Niebuhr, from a fragmentary record, a few scraps of ballad song, constructs the history of a nation; or a Prescott, or Motley, brings before us the scenes and the men of by-gone ages with all the freshness of the living present, and with a clearer conception of the ruling spirit of the men and their times.

So to the literature of the imagination, strictly so called, we should assign only the works of pure fiction. And yet we find it no easy task to separate the elements of fact from the pure artistic creation. As Bayne somewhere suggests, it is no easy thing for the imagination to flap its wings in a vacuum. The best works of the imagination have a basis of fact; even when its head is lost in the clouds, its feet rest upon and move along the solid earth. The epics of Homer and Virgil, the dramas

of Shakspeare, and the fictions of Scott, all have a basis in some historic fact, some fundamental law of human life and conduct. Poetry is but the idealization of the actual. The distinction we make, or attempt to make, in literature, is therefore quite imperfect, since the different elements mutually play into each other, and all the more as we ascend into its higher circles; in the literature of knowledge, to use De Quincey's phrase, the less so, but in the literature of power they are more completely fused and blended, like the prismatic colors in order to the pure white light. Yet, for convenience, we must make the distinction, according to the predominance of the one or the other element, of fact or of imagination; and, hence, though we must follow the usual division, and place Romance on the side of the literature of the imagination, we must not lose sight of the solid realities on which it rests.

And here again we must distinguish between poetry and prose fiction; and between the literature of the imagination properly so called, and the literature of the fancy. We might also divide prose fiction into the Romance and the Novel. But first it seems necessary to consider the distinction made with reference to the faculties more immediately concerned, whether the imagination or the fancy.

The imagination belongs to the sphere of ideas. A genuine work of the imagination is an organic whole, the embodiment of an idea; all its parts, even to the minutest detail, inspired, so to speak, and made vital by the informing principle, and so having a place in the whole. There is nothing accidental, nothing left to chance. There may be great freedom, as there always is in the expression of life; but, as in some of the Shakspearian dramas, every character introduced, every act exhibited, every word spoken, stands in relation to the whole, and is determined by laws as fixed as those regulating the growth of the plant, or any form of animal life. The highest exercise of the imagination, its loftiest flight, its greatest freedom, is still subject to law. As Allston says of Rubens, —

“His lawless style, from vain pretension free,  
Impetuous rolling like a troubled sea,  
High o'er the rocks of Reason's ridgy verge  
Impending hangs; but, ere the foaming surge



Breaks o'er the bound, the under-ebb of taste  
Back from the shore impels the watery waste." \*

A work of the imagination is always for the sake of the ideas. The material, whether marble, colors, or words, is wholly subordinate. The thought is the thing. It is not the strange adventure, the deed of heroism, the toil and struggle, in themselves, that interest us in the epic or the drama; but the humanity that finds expression in them, the ideas that are independent of place and time, that give an abiding, ever fresh interest to the works of genius. The stories of Macbeth, Richard III., and Henry V. were familiar enough before they passed under the hand of the great dramatist; but his imagination connected them with the eternal laws and principles of human nature, and they became as imperishable. The historian would have told the story of the loyalty of the Highlanders to the House of Stuart, and the lover of natural scenery would have found his way to the lochs of Scotland, and the lakes of Cumberland, had Scott never written, nor Wordsworth sung, — but where were the glory that invests them now, not of light and shadow, but of noble thoughts and human interests?

The fancy, on the other hand, is the faculty of sense. It belongs to the sphere of material forms, the changing, the sensuous and temporary, rather than to the ideal and eternal. A work of the fancy, therefore, is not an organic but a mechanical whole, if a whole at all. No law prescribes the place, or the limits, or the number of its parts. It is lawless. Its conduct is inexplicable. It is the play of the spirit buoyant with its own life, and seeking expression, it matters not how; it is the fountain overflowing, and sending its waters, it knows not and cares not whither. The lamb sporting on the greensward, the little child not less busy in the display of its joyous health and happiness, are the best representatives of the fancy. So the poet, sometimes relaxing the reins, allowing free play to his creative powers, as weaker souls indulge in reverie, revels in wild sport amid the sensuous imagery with which his mind is stored. So Spenser often in the "Faëry Queen;" and we follow the Red Cross Knight, Sir Guion, or Sir Calidore, little knowing where they may lead us, or through what adventure

\* "Lectures," p. 376.

with painim or foul fiend, by land or sea, only with the general assurance that the imagination of the poet has set a limit to these wild excursions somewhere, possibly at the end of so many lines or cantos, and with the promise that each character will be sufficiently true to itself. A still better example is furnished in the strange freaks of Undine, justly amazing her supposed parents, because purely fanciful and lawless and so inexplicable. The fancy is thus the imagination acting without a definite controlling purpose.

Keeping in mind these radical differences in their nature, we may next notice the relative place and share of each in the different forms of what we have called the literature of the imagination. There are of course but few works in which they are not more or less intermingled; at least there are but few works of the fancy that have not more or less of the genuine marks of the imagination. The conception of a work, the general method pursued, and the limits are derived from the imagination; the details, the filling up of the outlines only are due to the fancy. Sometimes, too, in a work of the imagination, the poet gives free play to his fancy in some subordinate part, as in some of the speeches of Madame Quickly, or in the account of Queen Mab, but there is usually a method in this madness.

It will help us, also, if we distinguish between the higher and the lower exercise of the imagination; between what may be termed the creative or suggestive, and the delineative. The former, resting more on the side of ideas, and employing natural imagery rather to illustrate and suggest, is the special prerogative of the great masters, while the latter holds closely to fact, and invests the actual, as the historical narrative or the landscape, with something of its own ideality. To the first belong the higher creations of epic, dramatic, and lyric song; to the latter, the simpler ballad, the poetic narrative and description. Of these different forms, we shall notice only those more immediately related to our subject,—the epic and the ordinary poetic narrative. Both have an historical basis, but the first, besides the common poetic coloring, is elevated above the ordinary sphere of life and conduct by the grandeur of its ruling ideas, and the consequent grandeur of the representative characters and of the scenes in which they move, and by the

introduction of supernatural agents, in order to the better realization of the general purpose. Yet it is never the events, nor the characters, however great in themselves, that command our interest, but their truthfulness, not to the actual simply of human life, but to its ideal hopes and aspirations, to the fundamental instincts and longings of human nature. The epic is the work of the imagination in its largest, noblest exercise, representing to us ideas that belong rather to the ideal and supernatural world, yet strictly according to its own inward controlling laws. And it chooses verse, as the most appropriate dress not only of poetry in general, but especially of this, its highest form; since the emotion, half suppressed in consequence of the laws of verse, adds to its suggestiveness and power.

Such lofty examples, such idealizations of human life and character, are fundamental needs of the human race. Christianity supplies them in its revelations of divine truth and of the divine character. Literature offers them in epic story. The "*Iliad*" and the "*Odyssey*" were the Greek Bible. The heroes of Homer were the ideals of the Greek youth, their highest conceptions of humanity. In the later epics, the conception and the range of thought are upon the same or a higher level, the highest possible known to the writers.

We may now locate Romance literature; and we shall do so the more readily if we look back to the period of its greatest richness and splendor, to the close of the Middle Ages. Upon the waking up of the human mind from its long sleep, flooded with the superstitious conceptions of every barbarous tribe, Gothic or Saracenic, that had swept over the Roman empire, with fragments of historic and religious truth and more abundant error, its inheritance from Greek and Roman civilization, — yet waking up from its long slumber with renewed strength and creative power, its imagination, without ideas and without law, in other words its fancy, found expression in song and story, which, as distinguished from other births of the human mind, was called Romance. Common causes led to its almost simultaneous rise among the different nations of Europe. It was the embodiment of floating notions and superstitious fancies, half heathen, half christian, sometimes resting on a slight foundation of fact, sometimes pure creations, yet always sufficiently true to the real character of the time.

It is not our purpose to enter into a detailed notice of the different stories, or of the changes that Romance experienced under the constantly increasing light that announced and ushered in the modern period. It must suffice to say that after a time the word obtained a more restricted sense, and became confined to those historical narratives combining the popular ideas of the supernatural world with the events of ordinary life. And ere long the necessity of ideal models of character found expression in the two cycles of stories of which Arthur and Charlemagne respectively were the central figures. In them, according to an ingenious writer in the "Quarterly Review" for 1859, to whom we are indebted for the suggestion, — in them, and in the chiefs that surrounded them, as in the "Iliad," were represented the highest conceptions of humanity which the vague notions of Christianity and the supernatural then possessed, blended with barbaric ignorance and superstition, and feudal civilization, could attain to.

This Romance, therefore, for substance, corresponds to the old epic; but wholly unlike the epic as a work of imagination working according to law, it is rather the work of the imagination acting without law, or any clearly defined ideas to inform it. Hence, more strictly speaking, it was the work of the fancy, as the blind impulse of the creating power, working with such materials as it had, without the least regard to truth or probability, and with only the most general purpose in view. There was this same general purpose in both the epic and the Romance, realized in the one case by the imagination, and in the other attempted by the fancy. Yet it is not the fancy as the free *abandon* of the imagination, but the fancy in earnest, — not the fancy in any conscious exercise, but rather the imagination in such condition as to be no more than fancy, in consequence of the absence of clearly defined truthful ideas and of all discipline to realize them. Or we might term Romance the product of the creative powers while as yet the imagination and the fancy are working blindly together, waiting for the clear distinctions that are the result of the fuller development of the human mind.

The near relation of Romance to poetry was shown by the early adoption of verse as its form of composition; but soon

prose was employed because of its greater freedom. Just as comedy, which holds much the same relation to tragedy, in the drama, chooses prose as its fitting form of representation.

This condition of the public mind at the close of the Middle Ages has its counterpart in the experience of the individual; — in the waking up of conscious power, without as yet the sobering influence of truth to inform and direct, and the actual experience of the world to correct its illusive expectations. The ideal floats vaguely before the eye, the imagination undisciplined finds its pleasure in free play, and shrinks from the control of reason. The love of the ideal and the supernatural, and of the mysterious because giving play to the imagination, furnishes a lasting response to the fictions of Romance. And yet it is not the marvels alone, not the strange incidents alone, that so long interested and absorbed the human mind, and that still make the story of Arthur and the knights of the Round Table a favorite with English boys, but the real solid truth of character. "The Arthurian Romance," observes the critic already cited, "is national; it is Christian. It is also human in the largest and deepest sense; and therefore, though highly national, it is universal, for it rests upon those depths and breadths of our nature to which all truly great developments in all nations are alike essentially and closely related."\* Hence it is that only those Romances have lived that were the earnest attempt to represent some substantial truth to the human mind. The wonders of magic, the hair-breadth escapes, all the usual material of the Romance writer, has no abiding hold upon the popular mind, save as it becomes the medium, coarse it may be, but really the medium of conveying truth to the human heart. And as such, these old stories have from time to time been revived in literary history. The story of Arthur has tempted men like Milton, Dryden, and Coleridge, as the fitting subject of a national epic. The genius of Spenser used the material of the old Romance for the gorgeous drapery of the Christian ideas of the modern period, refined, to be sure, and thus made to correspond to the advance of general culture attained by his age. And of late it has been subjected to another process of purification at the hands of Tennyson, "recommended to us," as one of

\* "London Quarterly," 1859, p. 258, Am. ed.

his best critics remarks,\* "by the measured grace of his verse, reflecting here and there the emotions and sympathies of a later age. And yet the "Idyls" of Tennyson are as nearly as possible reproductions of the letter and spirit of the Arthurian legends." According to the practice of the original composers of Romance, the poet has allowed himself the utmost liberty in regard to the incidents he employs, only preserving truth of character, according to the old traditions.

As refined of its grossness and elaborated by modern culture, the old Romance still lives and finds its place in literature. It lives because it meets some of the deeper wants of the human soul,—its longings for freedom, its gladsome play of imagination, unhampered by the hard bonds of fact, which beset its finite capabilities. And though this indulgence must be coupled with temperance, and excess leads to a dangerous intoxication, yet on occasion the most earnest souls find pleasure in these excursions into fairy-land, away from common life, into the region of the strange, the mysterious, and the impossible, where fancy is at liberty to create and dissolve at will, and to disguise every object in shapes and colors of her own;—all this in play and relaxation, and yet not wholly in vain, because of some thought which, however feebly and faintly, still shines through all, giving it the right to be and to engage the interest we bestow.

In the hazy atmosphere, or dim twilight rather, of the Middle Ages, were found, as at no other period in the history of literature, the conditions of Romance; the grand outlines of truths rather than actual truths, and these, too, often running into each other, with just details enough to connect them with human interests and sympathy, and give a spring to the imagination to fill them up as it could. The necessity of such conditions was recognized by Scott in his poetical Romance, and later when he left the historical novel for prose Romance. He employs historical incident in the development of his plot, quite in the style of the old Romance, while he goes back to a period sufficiently remote, and to a state of society sufficiently unlike his own, to be free from the commonplace details that would otherwise have embarrassed his invention, and prevented that

\* "Ed. Review," July, 1859.

suspense of the mind on the part of his readers, necessary to give full effect to the marvellous and mysterious incident he introduces. He needs just distance enough for atmosphere, — the dim hazy atmosphere of the old Romance, over which to cast a visionary radiance from his imagination, — and so, as in “*Ivanhoe*,” he goes back to a period earlier than in his historical novels; to a time in some sense mythical to us, and when we willingly allow him free play to his imagination.

The close relation of Romance to poetry was well illustrated in the literary history of Sir Walter Scott, in his early transition from the “*Lady of the Lake*” and “*Marmion*,” to the historical novel and Romance. Indeed Jeffrey does not hesitate to call “*Ivanhoe*” a poem. So Shakspeare took from the old stories much of his material, — incidents, manners, characters, and entire plots. He also goes back to the earlier periods in those plays, as “*Macbeth*” and “*King Lear*,” that bear most of those characteristics from which the name Romance drama is derived.

We have now noticed two of the forms in which the spirit of Romance has been preserved in modern times; — the first in the “*Faëry Queen*” of Spenser and the “*Idyls*” of Tennyson; and the second in the historical novels and romances of Scott. A third form is peculiar to our age, and is represented by Fouqué, Hawthorne, and Holmes. The two forms already noticed have preserved more faithfully the idea of Romance. Spenser and Tennyson retained for substance the old material, but threw over it, the one a gorgeous, the other a delicate, drapery of poetic thought. Scott toned down rather the quality of his material, and reproduced and revived a former age, freed of much of its grossness, and with its better qualities idealized. The later Romance abandons the old material altogether, adopts our modern society with all its habits, associations, and tastes, and then imports from the old the element of mystery, in some weird fancy, that might more properly belong to a former age, and yet is not so far removed from the ordinary range of our experience, as to prevent us from yielding to the necessary illusion. It thus approaches the novel, in fact differs from it only by this element of mystery, which allows of course a greater ideality of incident and a freer exercise of the



imagination, and so the introduction of the strange and the marvellous that would not be allowed in the novel, as, for instance, the land-slide that buried up Rattlesnake Ledge upon the death of Elsie Venner. Thus the field of modern Romance lies in the supposed subtle and mysterious sympathies between the powers of nature and the human soul, — in a kind of intermediate twilight between the known and the unknown, in which there is just enough of inexplicable facts to excite our curiosity and wonder, and make us willing to suspend our judgment at the will of any bold Romancer, and not enough for science or solid beliefs. In our modern Romance as compared with the old, there has been a change in the relative agencies of the fancy and the imagination, to correspond with the advancing intellectual discipline and culture of the age. The fancy now has a different part; instead of its free, bold play with the material of the Romance, it rather furnishes the essentially romantic element in the story, and this is worked out, developed in its various manifestations, under a much stricter supervision of the imagination.

The novel has remained substantially unchanged. It is still a picture of common life idealized. It corresponds therefore to the narrative poem, just as the higher forms of Romance do to the epic. Its incidents must always be truthful to common life, — only more truthful as presenting it stripped of its commonplaces, and thus holding up its essential features more distinctly to our contemplation. The interest of the Romance, so far as it is genuine, turns upon the marvellous and the mysterious. Notwithstanding the changes it has undergone, the essential grounds of interest have been preserved. In the old Romance the imagination furnished the idea of the characters and prescribed the general limits of their representation, but left the details almost wholly to fancy within those limits. So in *Undine*, *Donatello*, and *Elsie Venner*, the imagination first places us in a sort of fairy-land, makes us accept of certain impossible conditions, gratifies our love of the marvellous, our desire for freedom from the ordinary limitations of human life, and then leaves the fancy to develop the characters introduced under its supervision. This last form, as seen in Hawthorne and Holmes, is therefore rather a combination of the Romance

with the novel, than genuine Romance. It requires greater delicacy of treatment, it allows more of the niceties of art, but lacks in breadth and scope, in grandeur of character and incident, — giving proof of skilful analysis, subtle speculation, but having little of the primitive freshness and large-hearted simplicity of the old Romance.

If we were to inquire into the moral character of the literature of the imagination generally, and so of Romance, we should recognize the same principles we have been illustrating. The imagination works according to fundamental laws of the human mind. Its creatures are true, present in fact ideal truth. There is an old French story, that when Innocence left the world, she met Poetry on the confines. The sisters met, embraced, passed on their several ways, Innocence back to heaven, and Poetry down to earth, to present to men henceforth in ideals what could no longer be real. This gives in a word the office of poetry, of art, of all imaginative literature. Hence the work of the imagination, whether the epic, the drama, or the novel, is "a fit representation," to use the words of Chevalier Bunsen, "of events consistent with the highest laws of moral government, whether it delineate the general history of a people, or narrate the fortunes of a chosen hero." And those only have lived that have satisfied this requirement. Their excellence lies in this truthful apprehension and exhibition of the course of human life as determined by moral laws that have been made permanent in the moral constitution of the world. Every genuine work of the imagination is fitted to exert a moral influence, and failing to do so is to be condemned not less on literary than on moral grounds. Vinet, in a criticism upon the "*Henriade*" of Voltaire, says of epic poems, that they "are true human bibles: the commemoration of a great event in them serves to consecrate a great truth."\*

The Romance, as the work of the fancy, and so far as it is true to its character as Romance, is out of the pale of morals. Its influence is purely negative. It obtains a moral character, if at all, from the presence of the imagination to some extent, and from the character that may attach to the material it employs. Hence in the absence of the moral pur-

\* "French Lit. 18th Century," p. 268.

pose that presides over all works of the imagination, the general tone of Romance has often been on the side of immorality ; and we are not surprised that the old Romance soon degenerated to such a degree as to merit the severe censure and condemnation of the early Reformers, and ere long to die out. The novel has also been employed for the same unworthy ends ; but the human mind sooner or later casts off such abuses, and reserves for an abiding place in its literature only such works as really minister to the substantial needs of humanity.

---

## ARTICLE V.

### UZZEN-SHERAH ; AND ISRAEL'S RIGHT TO CANAAN.

And his daughter was Sherah, who built Beth-horon the nether, and the upper, and Uzzen-sherah.—1 Chron. vii. 24.

WHAT portion of the Scriptures is so often passed over as uninstructional, in reading, as the genealogies in the beginning of the First Book of Chronicles ? And what name, in the whole dry catalogue, is less suggestive of instruction than Uzzen-Sherah, mentioned only that once in the whole Bible ? And yet, in what we may know of its history and relations, is evidence that the Israelites, under Joshua, had a right, even according to human law, to enter Canaan as they did, and recover, by force of arms, their ancient heritage.

Many, perhaps most, have justified that act on the ground of God's command to do it, virtually admitting that it had no other ground of justification. But probably few thinkers ever felt perfectly satisfied with that defence. The question will recur to considerate minds, whether God would or could make a wrong act right by simply commanding it. The assumption that he did, or could, seems to imply that he knows nothing of, or cares nothing for, any "eternal and immutable morality ;" that his will is perfectly lawless, conforming to no idea of right in his own mind ; and that Abraham, when he argued that "the Judge of all the earth" must "do right," was talking

perfect nonsense ; because, if nothing is right or wrong except as made so by his will, then destroying the righteous with the wicked, if he should please to do it, would be just as right as making a difference between them. A strong point, indeed, seems at first sight to be made, of God's command to Abraham, to offer up his son Isaac. But, perhaps, in an age when God is to be worshipped by sacrifices, it is not wrong for a man to offer up his son, when he knows, as Abraham did, that after the offering up, that son will be alive, and be the father of a numerous posterity, in whom all the families of the earth shall be blessed. So Paul, Heb. xi., evidently understood the case. But let us come back to Uzzen-Sherah.

When Abraham entered Canaan, a great part of the land was unoccupied. It belonged to the human race. No person, family, tribe or nation, had appropriated it since the flood, or laid any claim to it. Some Canaanites had come there before him, and occupied some parts of it ; as they had a right to do. He, as he had the same right to do, came and occupied other parts. God, who sees the end from the beginning, promised the whole of it to his seed, knowing that it would all ultimately come into their hands without injustice. But, independently of this promise, as a matter between man and man, between Abraham and the Canaanites, he had the same right as they, to come and occupy vacant lands between the Jordan and the Mediterranean. So they all understood it, and treated him accordingly. See, for proof, the history of his rescue of Lot, in association with Aner, Eshcol and Mamre ; his intercourse with Melchizedek, and his purchase of the cave of Machpelah at Hebron. In all these transactions he is treated, not as a lawless intruder, but as "a mighty prince," in every respect fully their equal. He neither acquired nor sought to acquire an exclusive property in any land except that at Hebron ; but his right to occupy and use any land in Canaan not yet appropriated by others, was perfect, and was universally acknowledged.

Isaac inherited his father's right of occupancy ; and in addition to it, acquired an acknowledged ownership of certain wells which he digged, and of course, as much land round about them as was necessary to their advantageous use. His

first movements in this direction were frustrated by the opposition of other claimants, to whom, we know not for what reason, he saw fit to yield ; but afterwards, especially at Beersheba, he acquired a title which was not only not disputed, but solemnly acknowledged. (Gen. xxvi.)

Esau having retired to Mount Seir, Jacob inherited his father's rights in Canaan, and made still further acquisitions. Especially, he bought, for a hundred pieces of money (Gen. xxxiii. 19,) "a parcel of ground" near Shechem, which he gave to his son Joseph, where was the well, afterwards made famous by Christ's conversation with the woman of Samaria. This land was, and still is, an excellent tract for pasturage. He made this gift to Joseph just as he was about to die, when he had been seventeen years in Egypt. (Gen. xlvii. 28 ; xlviii. 22.) He still regarded himself as the owner of that land. He claimed, also, the real estate of the family at Hebron. (Gen. xlix. 29-32.) This last claim was acknowledged valid by the Hittites at Hebron, on the occasion of his burial, as is evident from their behavior on that occasion. The sojourn of Jacob and his family in Egypt was not understood, either by themselves or the Canaanites, as a relinquishment or forfeiture of their right to their lands in Canaan.

The charge which Joseph gave concerning his bones, (Gen. l. 24-26,) shows that he then entertained the same views ; that he regarded the family lands in Canaan as still theirs, and to be reoccupied as aforetime. He "was thirty years old when he stood before Pharaoh," (Gen. xli. 46,) and thirty-nine when Jacob arrived in Egypt, as seven years of plenty and two years of famine had then elapsed, (Gen. xlv. 11 ;) so that when he died, aged one hundred and ten, the Israelites had been in Egypt seventy-one years. Up to that time, there had been no intentional or acknowledged relinquishment of their claim. As he was buried at Shechem, (Josh. xxiv. 32,) his charge probably referred to his land there, and implied a claim to it. But of this claim there is other proof, coming down to a later date, and connected with Uzzen-Sherah. We read, (1 Chron. vii. 20-28) : —

"20. And the sons of Ephraim ; Shuthelah, and Bered his son, and Tahath his son, and Eladah his son, and Tahath his son,

"21. And Zabad his son, and Shuthelah his son, and Ezer, and Elead, whom the men of Gath that were born in that land slew, because they came down to take away their cattle.

"22. And Ephraim their father mourned many days, and his brethren came to comfort him.

"23. And when he went in to his wife, she conceived and bare a son, and he called his name Beriah, because it went evil with his house.

"24. (And his daughter was Sherah, who built Beth-horon the nether, and the upper, and Uzzen-sherah.)

"25. And Rephah was his son, also Resheph, and Telah his son, and Tahan his son,

"26. Laadan his son, Ammihud his son, Elishama his son,

"27. Non his son, Jehoshua his son.

"28. And their possessions and habitations were Beth-el, and the towns thereof, and eastward Naaran, and westward Gezer, with the towns thereof; Shechem also and the towns thereof, unto Gaza and the towns thereof."

The first Shuthelah and the first Tahath probably died young, and other sons, born after their death, were called by their names.

Ezer and Elead, the eighth and ninth sons, were slain by "the men of Gath," "because they came down to take away their cattle." They "came down" from the high region where Shechem was, to the low seaboard region in which Gath was situated, "to take away their cattle." Whether these cattle were their own, that had been pastured in the low country, or had strayed, or been stolen, or were cattle belonging to the men of Gath, that they attempted to take in reprisal for some alleged wrong, or from the mere love of plunder, we are not informed, nor is it of any importance in this inquiry. They were up among their pasture lands at and around Shechem, and they "came down" to the plains after cattle, and were slain. The point is, that the family of Ephraim, the son of Joseph, to whom Jacob had given that parcel of land, still occupied it for the rearing of cattle; and that their occupation was rendered dangerous by encounters with "the men of Gath, that were born in that land."

But the occupation of that land by that family was not relinquished on the death of Ezer and Elead. They carried on a

very extensive grazing business there, with a very persistent determination, in the time of Sherah. She "built Beth-horon the nether, and the upper." The position of these towns deserves consideration. They guard the upper and lower terminations of the principal pass from Egypt, the low seaboard of the Philistines and the plain of Sharon, to the high lands of Shechem, "and the towns thereof." It was doubtless by this pass, that Ezer and Elead "came down to take away their cattle." By this pass, they would be obliged to return with the cattle to Shechem. And if the men of Gath waylaid them and fell upon them at unawares, this pass, then unguarded, furnished an excellent opportunity for doing it; the only favorable opportunity on the whole route. It was evidently to protect and accommodate travel by that pass, that Sherah built the two Beth-horons; as there is no other obvious reason why either of them should ever be built at all. The name seems to refer to this object, signifying, according to Gesenius, "the House of the Hollow; perhaps, of the Hollow Way." He derives it from an obsolete root, signifying "to hollow out, to bore;" whence come nouns signifying "hole," "cavern," "window," and in Arabic, the mouth of a river. Hence, naturally, place of entrance, passage.

Dr. Robinson, in his first exploration of Palestine, ascended this pass on his way from Ekron, (often mentioned in connection with Gath,) by Lud, now Lydda, to Jerusalem. The ascent is on a ridge between two ravines, which subside into shallow wadys and unite just below the nether Beth-horon. Upper Beth-horon was reached in one hour from leaving the lower; which corresponds well with the distance, about two miles, on Kiepert's map. Ekron is some twelve or fifteen miles a little south of west from the nether Beth-horon; and Shechem, about twenty-five miles from the upper, a little to the east of north.

"Down this pass, Joshua drove the five kings of the Amorites who made war upon Gibeon. Both the upper and the lower town were afterwards fortified by Solomon. At one of them, Nicanor was attacked by Judas Maccabæus; and the same was afterwards fortified by the Syrian Bacchides. Cestius Gallus, the Roman proconsul of Syria under Nero, after having burned Lydda, ascended the moun-



tain by Beth-horon, and encamped near Gibeon. . . . From all this, it appears that in ancient times, as at the present day, the great road of communication and heavy transport between Jerusalem and the sea-coast was by the pass of Beth-horon."

(Bib. Researches, iii. 60, 61.)

The building of these two towns implies not only the erection of more or less houses in each, but the settling of her retainers in them, in sufficient numbers to answer the purpose for which the towns were built. The whole number of her retainers must have been large, when she could afford to detach so many of them from the main body for such a purpose. And her business, and that of "the house of her fathers," between Shechem and Egypt, must have been very large indeed, to justify such an appropriation of men and means for the protection of a single pass on the road.

But this is not all. She also built "Uzzen-Sherah," — of which we can know only what we can learn from this mention of it. And first, we naturally ask the meaning of the word.

Gesenius (*Lex. in Voce*) says, that it means "ear of Sherah, or Sherah's corner." He derives Uzzen from a conjectural root, signifying "to be sharp, acute, pointed," as are the ears of some animals; whence its cognate nouns, signifying "an ear," and a "pointed weapon." Taken in this sense, perhaps we should call the place Sherah's Point. The only other name which can throw light upon it, if it means an "ear," is Aznoth-Tabor, (Josh. xix. 34,) which he renders "ears, *i. e.* summits of Tabor." But Tabor is usually regarded as having only one summit. Dr. Robinson says (Bib. Res. iii. 212): "The proper summit consists of a beautiful little oblong plain, or basin, twelve or fifteen minutes in length from northwest to southeast, by six or eight in breadth." But he adds: "This is skirted on the southwest by a ledge of rocks of some altitude, covered with foundations and ruins, and on the northeast by lower rocks; and this higher ground on both sides is thickly overgrown with bushes and small trees." If the summit of Tabor is fancifully called a head, these two rocky elevations on opposite sides may not unnaturally be regarded as its "ears." And we may well suppose that in the time of Joshua, both had been built upon, for purposes of safety from attacks of enemies.

And this suggests the inference, that Uzzen-Sherah was built on some similar elevation, for the sake of easy defence.

But there are etymological difficulties in the way of considering Uzzen and Aznoth as the singular and plural of the same noun, and etymological reasons for suspecting, at least, that Uzzen is rather connected with such names as Uzai, (Neh. iii. 25,) and Uzzi, (1 Chron. vii. 2,) which Gesenius regards as identical. With these references, those who choose may easily investigate the matter in their Hebrew Bibles and Lexicons. If so, it comes from a root signifying "to make strong," "to protect," and some of the derivatives of which signify "fortified." If this is its etymology, Uzzen-Sherah means Sherah's Fort ; and we learn directly, from the definition of the name, what, on the other supposition, we are obliged to infer from the metaphorical description of the locality. Both etymologies lead us to the same conclusion : that Uzzen-Sherah was a place of military strength ; a place built for protection against enemies ; — in a word, a fort.

It might help us in our inquiries, could we ascertain where Uzzen-Sherah was situated ; but the attempt seems hopeless. If we understand it, with Gesenius, to mean Sherah's Point, the location of nether Beth-horon, on the point between two wadys where they join, would well answer to the description ; but the places are evidently distinguished from each other. On the ascent from nether to the upper Beth-horon, about one third of the way from the bottom, at "the top of the first offset or step of the ascent," Dr. Robinson saw "foundations of large stones, the remains, perhaps, of a castle which once guarded the pass." He describes nothing here like a "point," or "corner," or "ear ;" but if we read it Sherah's Fort, and if the fort was intended to guard the approach to Shechem against "the men of Gath" and their neighbors, this was the very spot for it. The sacred text certainly suggests that it had some connection with the Beth-horons. But that connection may have consisted only in being built for a common purpose — the protection of their herds and herdsmen against hostile Canaanites. The fort may have been far off, at another extremity of their possessions. But wherever it was, it seems to have disappeared before the time of Joshua. The name does not appear in any

list of towns conquered by him, or of towns assigned to any tribe, or as marking any boundary. In fact, after this record of the building of it, it is not mentioned at all. We shall recur to this fact, of the early disappearance of the name from history, while the name of Beth-horon remained, and remains, even to this day.

We shall succeed better, though but imperfectly, in inquiring when Uzzen-Sherah was built. This is an important point; for up to that time, at least, there was no relinquishment, by the Hebrews, of their rights in Palestine. Holding military possession of a territory, and fortifying it, is the very strongest assertion of a claim of right, and of the intention to retain it, that can be made; unless making expensive facilities for travel and transportation may be equally strong.

The time from the arrival of Jacob in Egypt to the exodus under Moses is usually reckoned to have been two hundred and fifteen years. At the time of his arrival, there were yet five years of famine. Hence, there had been two years of famine and seven years of plenty since Joseph's elevation, to which his marriage was subsequent. Ephraim was his second son; perhaps five or six years old when Jacob arrived. We cannot well suppose that Elead, this child's eighth son, was born sooner than forty years afterwards; or that Elead was less than twenty, when he and Ezer headed a dangerous expedition down into the plain after cattle. Their death must have occurred at least sixty years after the arrival of Jacob in Egypt. After their death, and the long mourning of their father, in due time Beriah was born; and then the statement is interposed parenthetically, that "his daughter was Sherah." Whose daughter? Evidently, it seems to us, Beriah's; though Gesenius says Ephraim's; but of that hereafter. If Beriah was twenty-five when Sherah was born, and she was twenty-five when she began to build, these fifty years, added to sixty, make one hundred and ten, ending twenty-five years before the birth of Moses, who was eighty at the time of the exodus. Probably, most of these estimates are too small, especially the last, as Sherah could hardly act as the "head of the house of her fathers" at the age of twenty-five. More probably, she was fifty, and Moses was already born, when she began to build.

Indeed, it is difficult to suppose that she acted as head of the family during the life of her father, or of any of his elder brothers. Perhaps we are to understand that not only Ezer and Elead, but all Ephraim's sons then living, were slain in that expedition after cattle, Shuthelah leaving issue, from whom the family of the Shuthalhites (Num. xxvi. 35) were derived. If so, it certainly "went evil with his house," and we cannot wonder that he "mourned many days." And if Beriah died comparatively young, the position of his daughter Sherah is not unnatural.

In these genealogies, the ages of parents at the birth of their children are not given, nor are children carefully distinguished from more remote descendants. The writer was only as precise in his statements as was required by the purpose for which he wrote. Compare the list of the sons of Shem in 1 Chron. i. 17 with Gen. x. 22, 23, and it appears that the last four were Shem's grandsons. Nor is this any impeachment of the writer's inspiration. If he was as precise in his statements as would be of any use for the purpose for which he wrote, and as precise as he professed to be, he did all that inspiration implies in such cases.

Writing thus, he has left us, in these remote times, somewhat uncertain how many of those named in the passage before us were strictly Ephraim's sons, and who of them were his more remote descendants. We know, however, that Elishama, the son of Ammilud, was head of the tribe at the time of the exodus, (Num. i. 10 ;) and that his grandson, Joshua, was old enough to be the special attendant on Moses, and to command the forces in a battle, (Ex. xvii. 9-13.) Elishama, therefore, must have been a very old man at that time, and his father, Ammilud, may very well have been the son of Ephraim ; and if so, the same must be true of all the sons named before him. A comparison with other genealogies strengthens this conclusion, that Elishama was the great-grandson of Joseph.

Moses and Aaron, we know, (Ex. vi. 16-20,) were the great-grandsons of Levi ; being the sons of Amram, who was the son of Kohath, who was the son of Levi. Aaron's grandson, Phinehas, appears, from the part he acted, (Num. xxv. 7,) to have been about as old as Joshua.

Zelophehad, who died early, leaving five unmarried daughters, was of the same generation with Joshua and Phinehas; being the son of Hopher, the son of Gilead, the son of Machir, the son of Manasseh, Ephraim's elder brother. (Num. xxvii. 1, and xxxvi.)

Nahshon, head of the tribe of Judah at the exodus, was also of the same generation. (1 Chron. ii. 3-10; Matt. i. 3, 4; Luke iii. 32, 33.) He was probably a young man for the office, but, like Joshua and Phinehas, old enough to be efficient.

Achan, the troubler of Israel at Jericho, was of the same generation with Amminadab, the father of Nahshon, Eleazer, the son of Aaron, and Nun, the father of Joshua. (Josh. vii. 1.)

Hur, who with Aaron, supported the hands of Moses during the battle (Ex. xvii.), was of the same generation with Eleazer, the son of Aaron; being the son of Caleb, the son of Hezron, the son of Pharez, the son of Judah. His grandson, Bezaleel, the artist of the Tabernacle, was one generation later than any that we have mentioned as men in active life. (1 Chron. ii. 3-20; Ex. xxxv. 30.)

Perhaps the bearing of these facts will be more obvious, if they are presented in tabular form, thus:—

#### J A C O B.

L E V I.		J U D A H.		J O S E P H.	
Kothath.	Pharez.	Zerah.	Manasseh.	Ephraim.	
Amram.	Hezron.	Zabdi.	Machir.	Ammihud.	Beriah.
Aaron.	Ram.	Caleb.	Carmi.	Gilead.	Elishama. Sherah.
Eleazer.	Amminadab.	Hur.	Achan.	Hopher.	Nun.
Phinehas.	Nahshon.	Uri.	Sons.	Zelophehad.	Joshua.
		Bezaleel.		Daughters.	

Here, those of the same generation, counting from Jacob, are set against each other; but it must not be supposed that they were all of the same age. Beriah, Sherah's father, was enough older than his brother Ammihud, Elishama's father, to allow the birth of five sons, and perhaps several daughters, between them. She had probably come to maturity before her cousin Elishama was born, and may have even been older than Ammihud. Still, she belonged to the same generation, counting from Jacob, with Moses, Aaron and Elishama, old men at the time of the exodus, and we cannot date her principal public

labors much earlier than the time of their birth. To so late a period, at least, we find the Israelites extensively engaged in pasturage on their lands in Canaan, occupying their country by military posts, and making costly arrangements for the safety of travel and transportation.

It cannot be objected, that the Israelites had not the numbers and wealth requisite for such large operations. Their force comprised, not merely the lineal descendants of Jacob, but numerous servants, or retainers. Abraham brought many with him into Canaan, and afterwards acquired others in Canaan and in Egypt. His herdsmen and those of Lot were so numerous, that they were forced to separate from each other. When he marched north to the rescue of Lot from captivity, he took with him three hundred and eighteen of his own men, armed, besides the forces of his allies. As men fit for military service are usually not more than one fifth of a population, and as some must have been left at home to guard the women and children and tend the flocks and herds, it would seem that the whole number of his people must have been at least two thousand. The portions which he gave to Ishmael and the sons of Keturah were probably from his subsequent increase, so that he left some two thousand servants, or more, to Isaac. Well might the sons of Heth say to him, (Gen. xxiii. 6,) "Thou art a mighty prince among us." From the several mentions of Isaac's prosperity and wealth, the property seems greatly to have increased under his management. Jacob was obliged to flee to Padan-aram with only his "staff;" but when he returned, twenty years afterwards, his adult male servants were numerous enough to form "two bands"; though, in his judgment, both bands were not a match for the four hundred armed men, with whom Esau came to meet him. Jacob was a good manager, and doubtless increased his wealth in Canaan, and on Isaac's death, inherited his vast property; for Esau had long since retired to Mount Seir, become rich there, so that he had "enough," and honorably stuck to his bargain about the birth-right. In view of such facts, it is not extravagant to suppose that Jacob, at the time of his descent to Egypt, may have been the head of a population of ten thousand persons, scattered over his various possessions, from Beer-sheba, in the extreme south,

where he then dwelt, eastward to Hebron and northward to Shechem and Dothan. These may well have increased, in the time of Sherah, to a formidable number.\*

Jacob took with him into Egypt, all his lineal descendants, not already there; but it is not said, nor is it probable, that he took with him all his people, collected from all parts of Canaan. They also "took their cattle, and their goods which they had gotten in the land of Canaan." Probably they took, not all their cattle, carefully gathered from all the land, but only what they had with them at Beer-sheba. The language, (Gen. xlv. 5-7,) is not so strongly universal in respect to their cattle and goods, as it is in respect to Jacob's descendants, of whom we are very carefully told that he took "all." He may have left some of his people at Shechem and elsewhere, to subsist as they could, and as their Canaanitish neighbors did, and may have aided them by supplies sent from Egypt. Or, if literally all went down, many may have returned five years afterwards, when the famine had ceased; and they may have multiplied greatly before the time of Sherah.

And as for wealth of other kinds, — Shechem belonged to the heirs of Joseph, who was "a first-rate business man," and who could hardly fail to become immensely rich during his long viziership of eighty years, from his first standing before

\* Patriarchal slavery seems to have originated soon after the flood, when each family was an independent government, and its head needed as many sons as his neighbors had, for defence against them, and for equality with them in wealth. Those who had not children enough of their own, would gladly give something for the privilege of adopting those of their neighbors, much as they gave something for their neighbors' daughters, as wives for their sons. These adopted children, "souls gotten" with money, had an interest in the prosperity of the family, and some one of them, in default of natural heirs, would become the head of it. Such was the prospect of Eliezer of Damascus, while Abraham was childless. Still, they were only servants, bought with money, or children of such servants, reared at the expense of the family, and constituting a part of its wealth. Very naturally, in the hands of unprincipled men, this practice degenerated into that of buying slaves of any one who offered them, asking no questions as to how the seller came by them. In the time of Jacob, there was a mart of this kind in Egypt, known to Midianish traders and others as far as Dothan and Damascus; as appears by the sale of his son Joseph. Africa seems to have invented this form of sin, and has been punished for it ever since by being made its victim. The Mosaic institutes concerning slavery seem intended to restrict it, as nearly as the hardness of the people's hearts and other circumstances would permit, to its original patriarchal character. The transition from these patriarchal families to petty "kingdoms" of a thousand or a few thousand souls, was very natural. It had evidently begun before the death of Abraham, and was far advanced, and in many cases might be said to have been completed, in the time of Jacob.



Pharaoh at the age of thirty, to his death, aged an hundred and ten.

Or we may come at an estimate of their numbers from an opposite direction. At the time of the exodus, their fighting men were 603,550, which, if it was one fifth of the whole number, the usual estimate, implies a total population of more than three millions, besides the Levites. (Num. ii. 32, 33.) If they had been doubling once in twenty years, which is scarcely credible, there must have been, at the birth of Moses, 37,721 fighting men, and 188,605 in all. If they doubled only once in twenty-five years, which is much more probable, their number at that time must have been about twice as large.

The language and conduct of the Egyptians, about this time, fully justifies these estimates. The statement of the king, (Ex. i. 9,) that "the people of the children of Israel are more and mightier than we," was doubtless extravagant. Had it been literally true, the subsequent oppression would not have been attempted, much less executed. But the whole course of action shows that the Egyptians regarded them as formidable in numbers and in power. The next verse expresses the apprehension that if they continued to increase, they would be able, by taking advantage of the next war, when the Egyptian army would be engaged with other enemies, to fight their own way, "and so get them up out of the land."

The Egyptians knew, it seems, that they had a country to go to, and that their country was "up" from Egypt. In the phraseology of those days, people always went "up" from Egypt to Canaan, and "down" from Canaan into Egypt. They evidently thought that they saw signs of such an intention on the part of the Hebrews, and must guard against it. If it should be accomplished, they would lose, not only a large and useful population, but the constant influx of the productions of Canaan, which the Israelites, probably, were in the habit of bringing down from their possessions in that country, and expending in Egypt. The operations of Sherah, in building towns and forts, might very naturally excite, or at least strengthen, this apprehension. Their increase must, therefore, be checked.

The most violent repressive measure, that of destroying the

male children, was adopted after the birth of Aaron, eighty-three years before the exodus, and before that of Moses, who was three years younger. It appears to have been too atrocious to be executed to any considerable extent, or for any considerable time. The existence of the generations of men to which Eleazer, Phinehas, Nahshon and Joshua belonged, shows that the attempt was abortive. Nor did the severe labors to which they were forced, prevent their increase; though the oppression to which they were subjected, must have seriously embarrassed them in their protection and use of their possessions in Canaan.

The Canaanites, whose hostile proceedings had compelled them to fight, with loss of life, for the defence of their cattle, and to build towns and forts for the protection of their travel and possessions, would not fail to make the most of this advantage. They would naturally push on their encroachments with greater energy than ever before. And the Israelites in Egypt could not reinforce their posts in Canaan. Pharaoh was already apprehensive that they would "get them up out of the land," and "would not let the people go" to Canaan for such a purpose. The heads of the tribes were rigidly detained in Egypt. The herdsmen and other retainers, without leaders, without instructions, without support of men or means from Egypt, must gradually succumb to superior force. These are details of which we have no recorded history; but, from the nature of the case, they must have happened. The result was, that before the time of the exodus, the Israelites had been dispossessed of every town, every fort, every rood of land, every hoof of flock or herd, throughout Canaan. The Beth-horons remained, for they were needed for the accommodation of travel; but Uzzan-Sherah was not needed for the protection of the Canaanites against themselves, and disappeared from history.

What became of the numerous population of herdsmen and other "servants" of the Israelitish nobility, we can only conjecture; but we may conjecture with a good degree of probability. Many of them must have fallen in defending themselves, their families, and their possessions against the Canaanites. Many would naturally fly to their masters in Egypt, if they

could ; and there is no evidence they could not. But on the other hand, the Canaanitish victors would naturally, according to the custom of the age, retain many of them in bondage to themselves ; and this may have been the fate of a large majority ; especially of the women and children. Certainly, when Joshua arrived, they had disappeared as a distinct people.

We are perfectly aware how many of our facts rest on no historic record, but are merely inferred from other facts. But we submit it to the reader, whether our inferred facts are not fairly inferred ; are not perfectly in harmony with those that are recorded ; and whether those on record do not necessarily imply the occurrence of these, or of others substantially like them. If so, it appears that Abraham and his seed came into possession of a large part of Canaan by fair, lawful, and righteous means, and retained their possession and use, even during their residence in Egypt, till they were unrighteously dispossessed by violence ; and that, according to the laws of nations, as understood and admitted always and everywhere, they had a perfect right to return and repossess their inheritance, and to use such force, and to inflict such damage and destruction on all opposers, as might be necessary for that purpose.

The original plan of Moses was, to have entered Canaan on the south, by way of Hebron ; but the opposition of the inhabitants of the land and the craven spirit of the Israelites compelled him to change it, (Num. xiii., xiv.,) and, after long wanderings in the wilderness, to beg a passage through Edom, which was refused. (Num. xx.) They were then attacked by the Canaanites under Arad, (Num. xxi.) and fought in their own defence. Then, after a long circuit round Edom, as they approached the Jordan from the east, first Sihon, and then Og, made war upon them, and suffered the result of unsuccessful war. The principal campaigns of Joshua, too, were made necessary by the hostile movements of the Canaanites themselves, who, making war on the Israelites, to keep them from repossessing their inheritance, were justly, by the laws of war and of nations, punished by the loss of their own. The record makes this plain in respect to his most important conquests ; and if it is not expressly stated in relation to some of his minor operations, fairness requires us to presume it.

If any object, that God gave the command to destroy those nations and possess their lands before they had made any attack on Israel, we reply, that it was not given before he knew that they would do it, nor without the foresight and consideration of their guilt in doing it. He gave the Israelites commands, which it would be right for them to execute in the circumstances in which he knew they would be placed. As he had said to Abraham, (Gen. xv. 16,) the Israelites were not allowed to take possession of the whole land, while "the iniquity of the Amorites" was "not yet full." But God knew when they would have filled up the measure of their iniquities, and he gave his promises and commands accordingly.

Doubtless, the Israelites, in their conquest of Canaan, did many things which God had not specifically commanded, and some of which were wrong; and doubtless many right things were done, which we are unable to justify, because, in the lapse of more than thirty centuries, the knowledge of the justifying facts has been irrecoverably lost. Some may think that God ought to have preserved that knowledge for our use, so that we might be able to see and prove the righteousness of every one of his acts and commands. But he is not careful to apologize with such minuteness, to those who have no confidence in him, for what it pleases him to do, or to command. If he has graciously enabled us to see his justice in the leading features and general course of these transactions; to show that the Canaanites deserved their doom, and brought it upon themselves by their rapacious and murderous injustice to the Hebrews; and that the Israelites, in reclaiming their possessions, acted in accordance with the universally acknowledged principles of international right, as well as the express command of God, this ought to be satisfactory, and to silence all misgivings as to the righteousness of any particular commands which we are unable to justify from our ignorance of all the facts, and from our inability, after so long a time, and such changes, social, moral, and intellectual, to appreciate the facts if we knew them.

There are two facts, which some may reject from such an investigation as being theological, but which are as really facts, to be taken into consideration in making out the history, as any others on record.

One is, that a righteous God, who requires all men to deal justly with each other, and who, at Sinai, forbade this very people to steal, and even to covet " anything that is thy neighbors," did command the Israelites to enter Canaan and take possession of it, by the use of all necessary force. This proves, if he was not most grossly inconsistent with himself, that taking possession of Canaan by the Israelites was not stealing, and that their desire to possess the lands then occupied by the Canaanites was not coveting anything that of right belonged to their neighbors and not to themselves. The history of the Israelites and of the Canaanites in relation to that land must have been such as justified the Israelites in desiring it and taking possession of it as their own. The facts which we have quoted from the Scriptures must have been a part of that history ; and the other parts of it must have been in harmony with these, and must have been morally equivalent to those which we have inferred.

The second is, that in all these transactions, God had regard to his great and holy name. One of his objects, often expressly declared, was, to manifest himself to all right-minded men, not only as an almighty sovereign, but also as a holy and righteous God. He could not, consistently with that design, exhibit himself as the patron and instigator of robbery and murder, by individuals or by nations. There must, then, have been facts, public facts, then known in that part of the world, in view of which the invasion and conquest of Canaan by the Israelites was an honest transaction. The known history of the Israelites and the Canaanites, and of their relations to that land, must have been such that, in view of them, God, in commanding and enabling the Israelites to conquer and possess the land, gave a favorable exhibition of his own moral character. The Israelites must have had well-known rights in the country, and the Canaanites must have been well-known wrongdoers, who deserved to be dispossessed and driven out. The history, as we have given it, consisting partly of recorded facts and partly of facts inferred, meets this requirement ; and this is a strong confirmation of its substantial truth.

This last consideration applies the more forcibly, if the struggle which ended in the expulsion of the Israelites from Canaan

continued many years, and could be remembered by old men at the time of the exodus; and this our chronology very well permits, and even renders probable. One of the last places to be relinquished by the Hebrews would be the pass of Beth-horon, which covered their retreat into Egypt. Elishama, the venerable head of the Ephraimites at the exodus, might well remember when they held that pass, and may even have witnessed the capture and demolition of his cousin Sherah's Fort. As a prominent young man of the tribe to which that region belonged, he may have been the last captain of an hundred, or of fifty, who attempted the defence of Uzen-Sherah.

---

## ARTICLE VI.

### CREEDS.

THE communion and friendly coöperation of Christians of every type for practical Christian ends must be regarded as important and conducive to the credit and advancement of Christianity in the world. There can be no question, that it is the will of our Master that all his disciples should be "one," for their own good and for the sake of their influence upon "the world"; a brotherhood, bound together, not by complete uniformity of administration and ceremonial, but by unity of spirit and mutual good-will. This is to be desired and earnestly labored for; to some extent, it is realized. The great conflict in our day, as well as in past ages, is not between one and another of the different sections of the Christian world; it is a contest between those who believe in the Gospel, and those who do not believe in it. The course of providential events, in recent times, has given fresh impulse to the desire of union, and has exercised a reconciling influence on the Christian sects. We rejoice in it; we want a progressive Church, steadily contemplating the glory of the Lord Jesus, and so "changed into the same image" by the agency of the Spirit of God.

There is danger, however, that the earnest effort for hearty Christian union, which is generally encouraged, may be attended by an indifference to Gospel truth, ignoring many of its essential doctrines, and suppressing the distinct utterance of those doctrines in some quarters, where they are not expressly denied. "Not doctrine, but life," is the cry of many. In some instances, the creed is diluted, and fundamental doctrines are carefully eliminated in a well-meant, but misguided effort to fashion "a Christianity large enough to hold all Christians," and to find *the* truth, which shall make all *forms* of truth comparatively insignificant. In other instances, the prominent doctrines, set forth in the Calvinistic confessions of the churches, are spoken of in disparaging and contemptuous terms by ministers, or passed over in preaching with cautious and significant silence. In other instances, to evade the opprobrium of being called dogmatist and bigot, there is a practical sacrifice of doctrines of the creed to a show of visible ceremonial uniformity, offering an easy and unquestioning recognition of the Christian name for all who claim it. There are conflicts of opinion among the different sects of the Christian world, and various shades of theological thought among those who fraternize in the same communion. It is not likely that the wisdom of the intellect will soon fuse them into beautiful unity. They will exist for the present, whether they stand out or not in any formal symbol. The questioning of our times is free and searching; it reaches down to the very foundations of things; it relates to the essential attributes and government of God and the everlasting destiny of the human soul. And it is a poor conceit to deprecate religious discussions as distracting and divisive, or to turn away from detailed articles of faith in churches, as unwarranted or injurious.

Our churches favor the use of creeds. With few exceptions, they have a brief summary of the leading doctrines of Christian faith, which is the exponent of their faith, the bond of their organic union, and the test of church-membership. It must necessarily be brief and synoptical. All readily see the importance of comprehensiveness in standards of faith; but all do not so easily perceive the importance of their being sound, distinct, and complete.



*The use of Creeds.* — We shall reach the safest and most satisfactory conclusions by examining first the origin of creeds, and their proper relation to the church, and then considering their utility.

Our first question is, *What is the origin of creeds?* In the apostolic churches, it was the avowal of faith in Christ which entitled any one to baptism and the fellowship of the church. The formula of the confession, however brief it might be, had reference, not to the life, but to the faith, assuming that the life would be Christian, if the faith were real. The notion is becoming extremely popular in our day, that a respectable life in place of any discriminating regard to doctrinal correctness, is to be the panacea for our ecclesiastical ills. "Modify your creeds," is the cry. "Remove the offensive definiteness; substitute a consideration of individual character instead of the acknowledgment of the truths of Christianity; make the life, not doctrine, the test of church-membership." Now there may be, connected with this proposal in some minds, an earnest desire, which we honor, for a deep piety and a thorough Christian life. But we have to object to this scheme, that it wholly reverses the method of the New Testament, and therefore gives poor promise of securing the desired fruit of a holy life. It is true that the Epistles of the New Testament direct attention to the conduct, showing that "the grace of God teacheth" us to deny "ungodliness and worldly lusts," and to live "soberly, righteously, and godly," in the world. It should be remembered that the Epistles were addressed to those already in the church, and, therefore, supposed to have accepted the scheme of doctrinal points, so emphatically and prominently enforced by the Epistles of Paul. After pronouncing that anathema upon him who preached any other doctrine than he had delivered, what would he have said to any one who might have sought admission into the church with an avowed rejection of any material portion of Christian doctrine? The simple declaration of belief in Christ, which was required in order to baptism in apostolic days, was brief, but it admitted of no ambiguity. And if it was as little ambiguous now as it was then, the brevity of the formula and the essential comprehensive confession then employed might still suffice.

In subsequent periods of the Church, creeds were formed to meet the exigencies which arose, and give an expression to the conclusions of Christians on important or contested points of religious truth. Minorities might, and did, frame creeds to express their convictions, as well as majorities. Many of them have perished. Others have been preserved, and some of them have been treasured up in the heart of the Church, and transmitted down through the centuries as the common confession of Christian faith on the points at issue, which they define. There is extant a brief summary of Christian doctrines called the *Apostles' Creed*, which, though it was not composed in a council of apostles, yet appears to have been the general creed of the Christian church, from at least the close of the *second* century, down to the Reformation — serving as a test of Christian orthodoxy, and as a guide in training and instructing “catechumens” in the principles of Christianity. In the form in which it has been adopted by most Protestant churches, it reads thus : —

“I believe in God, the Father, Almighty, Maker of heaven and earth; and in Jesus Christ, his only Son, our Lord; who was conceived by the Holy Ghost, born of the Virgin Mary, suffered under Pontius Pilate, was crucified, dead, and buried, he descended into hell, the third day he rose again from the dead, ascended into heaven, and sitteth on the right hand of God, the Father Almighty; from thence he shall come to judge the quick and the dead. I believe in the Holy Ghost, in the holy catholic church, the communion of saints, the forgiveness of sins, the resurrection of the body, and the life everlasting.”

This is a most valuable monument of the Church, as showing what in the early ages were considered the great, the peculiar, and the essential doctrines of the Gospel, namely, the *facts* here recounted.

New errors, at later periods, sprung up in succession. To testify against the heresy of Arius, the *Nicene Creed* was adopted, A. D. 325, in the celebrated council of three hundred eighteen members held at Nice, in Bithynia, and became the standard declaration of the Christian world down to the Reformation, on the doctrine of the Deity of Christ, — “God of God, Light of Light, very God of very God; begotten, not made; of the

same substance with the Father," &c. At the Reformation, the *Augsburg Confession* was the emphatic protest of the Lutheran reformers against the errors of the Papal Church, and a declaration of belief in the sufficiency of the Holy Scriptures, and the doctrines of the depravity of fallen man, the mediation of Christ, justification only by faith, and the sovereign grace of God. This became the standard of faith in the Lutheran churches. Subsequently, John Calvin embodied his views of Christian doctrine in his *Institutes* and the *Catechism of Heidelberg*. The Calvinistic system of doctrines is the basis of the Thirty-nine Articles of the English Church, and of the Catechisms and Confession of the Westminster Assembly of Divines, which were accepted substantially as their standard of faith by Old and New School Presbyterians, by Orthodox Congregationalists, and Baptists, in this country. The symbols of New England theology have reaffirmed and consented to the Confession of the Westminster Assembly of Divines. The Synod assembled in 1648, at Cambridge, to prepare a Platform and Confession for the Churches of Massachusetts, say :—

"The Synod, having perused and considered with much gladness of heart and thankfulness to God, the Confession of Faith published of late by the Reverend Assembly in England, do judge it to be very holy, orthodox, and judicious in all matters of faith, and do therefore freely and fully consent thereto, for substance thereof."

If ministers and churches agree in receiving the great principles of religion which are contained in the Word of God, and which are distinctly stated in that confession of faith, it is difficult to perceive any good reason why they should not, for the honor of their religion, publicly express their union in sentiment by a Scriptural creed. Thus we may declare and show to the world, that in many respects we agree with other branches of the Protestant church, though in some respects we differ from them. Our principles should be known.

The glance which we have taken at the origin and history of creeds shows that they are authorized by the New Testament. The brief but unequivocal formula there indicated, contains the principle of having creeds. The varying phases of error have from time to time rendered it necessary to guard new points and extend the details of our creeds.

Another question, which requires a few words of exposition, is, *What is the relation of a creed to a church?* The creed of a church is the basis of its organic union, and the expression of its Christian thought. It is its *organism*, through which the vital functions of the church are to be performed. Naturalists tell us of some animals which have a very simple and rude structure. In some instances, a single duct is the organ of digestion; in others, the circulatory organs are nearly wanting, and the whole body seems a rude pulpy mass. In animals which have a defective or low organization, but few of the functions which pertain to higher organizations can be performed, and those imperfectly. So it is with churches. A church which is organized by accepting the great leading truths of the Gospel in its confession of faith, has a structure through which the vital forces of religion can work. If it does not work in all goodness, it will be because the vital springs have not been quickened by the Holy Spirit.

A creed is the distinctive characteristic of a church. It is the boundary line which distinguishes a church from the world without and from other churches. It is the exponent of its faith, the expression of the Christian doctrines which a church presents to the world. Things exist in the world by distinction one from another. You identify or distinguish them by their differences and likenesses. A church is like an edifice, and its confession of faith is its outline and interior plan, and it should be complete and symmetrical. In the lowest idea of a church, which you can conceive, there must be somewhere a boundary line, in a symbol, either expressed or understood, which defines it, and separates those who are in it from those who are without. Dr. Channing argued strongly against human creeds as bonds of Christian union, and avowed his aversion to them. But those who accept him as their theological leader, have been constrained since his day to acknowledge that Christian churches, as organized bodies, cannot exist without having at least one article of faith,—and that is the confession of the superhuman and divine origin of Christianity. Theodore Parker took his ground outside of that confession, and they generally disowned him. Bringing to his cause talent, wit, earnestness, and application, he gained hearers, and gathered a

congregation around him which listened to his stated discourses, signifying an open and avowed hostility to Christian doctrine. The large scope of the so-called "liberal church," is not large enough to recognize such congregations, as being Christian churches. Everything and everybody cannot be embraced in it. The symbols of Calvinistic churches generally embrace not only a declaration of belief in Christianity itself, but also a detailed confession of the fundamental doctrines of the Christian system, as the basis of organization, not as the ground of salvation. The Bible is distinctly recognized by them as the supreme and only rule of faith and practice; — the only authoritative standard of appeal and of judgment. The creed tells how the church understands the Bible. If the creed becomes authoritative, dogmatic, final, and paramount to the Bible, as in the Papal Church, and, to a greater or less degree, in all hierarchies, this is an abuse of creeds, and the fault is in the administration of the church, not in its having a creed. This abuse is no reason for sweeping away all creeds any more than it is for abolishing all churches. In Congregational churches, the articles of faith define the church and distinguish its character; they express its Christian faith; they are its organic structure through which its vital functions are to be carried on; the abolition of these would be the dissolution of the church organization and the end of the church. They are the human form of the religious thought of the church, which the members agree in supposing that they have discovered in the Word and works of God; and within which they attempt to do the work which Providence has given them to do, never surrendering, of course, their individual right to explore the realm of truth for further light and knowledge.

The Israelites were enjoined to encamp "each by the standard of his tribe and the ensign of his father's house." They had the pillar of cloud and fire, in which the presence of the Lord went before them, as their great and authoritative ensign, which all the tribes followed. When that went forward, they marched; when that rested, they encamped and remained stationary; that was their rallying signal in all emergencies. But they had also their divisional standards, around which the respective tribes were to be marshalled for the march, for the

battle, or the encampment; each family also had its ensign. Yet all these subordinate standards of single tribes and families took the signals of the central ensign, which God himself held out. So creeds are subordinate standards. They have no right to have authority further than they take and reiterate what the Bible teaches.

Says John Robinson:—

“The constitution of the church is the orderly collection and conjunction of the saints into and in the covenant of the New Testament; wherein the saints are the matter and the covenant is the form, from which two concurring, the church ariseth, and is by them constituted.”

The faith which a church professes determines the form and structure of that church.

We pass now to the question, *What is the use of creeds?* The relation of a creed to a church, as just described, affords in part an answer to this question. It supplies the organic system of Christian principles, upon which the existence of a church depends. A church, with a well-arranged creed, is like the human body, which has a system of organs for the purposes of sensation, nutrition, and motion. The organs of the body are necessary to its existence and action. They are not all that is wanted; they are not sufficient without the vital powers to act through them. The body may have all the organs complete, and yet be dead. But the vital processes cannot go on in the body without the organs of digestion, circulation, respiration, sensation, and the like. The bodily organization in man is very complicated and wonderful; in the oyster it is very simple and restricted; but in each, it is indispensable to the processes of life. To apply the analogy, the creed, tacit or avowed, which a church adopts, supplies its organic structure, through which its life acts in its various forms. A church, as such, must have a belief, in order to be a church. If its confession can be carried no farther than the acceptance of Christianity in general, and a few elementary principles of the system, it will have a low and limited organization, and its life and work must be correspondingly feeble and circumscribed. If a church, to compromise with ignorance and prejudice, dilutes its creed, and

sloughs off one and another of the leading doctrines of the Bible, its organization will be proportionally narrow, and its living forces cramped. The best constitution of a church is where the leading doctrines of the Gospel are duly systematized and accepted in the creed, giving scope to the piety of the church to operate freely through all those doctrines, and leaving the way open to advance, by the study of the Word of God, into all the minor branches of Gospel truth.

A creed, moreover, lays a foundation for unity of action, *in unity of opinion*, in a church. It is evident, that all intelligent, harmonious action of a church must be based on coincidence of opinion, as to what the Bible teaches, at least in fundamentals. In an army, marching to subdue a revolted province, it is necessary that all, both officers and privates, should agree in firmly believing that the province is in a state of rebellion; and if any deny the fact of the crime of rebellion, and justify the secession as a reasonable measure of the province, common sense would say that they ought not to be in the army. In opinion, certainly, they would be with the seceders. They would not be reliable, in the decisive action, to help the ends of the government, but might be expected to go over to the enemy. Those who believe in the reality of the revolt, would exclude from their ranks those who denied it; and this measure would show not bigotry, not tyranny, but reason and common sense. How can those act together who do not think together, so far at least as to be able to aim at a common end, by common means? We maintain that the Bible, which is the only authoritative test and standard of appeal, is adapted to produce such agreement of opinion, as is necessary to intelligent and harmonious church action, or else it is very imperfect, and not able thoroughly to furnish the man of God for every good work. The acceptance of a common belief, or creed, is a professed agreement of opinion without which the church cannot act together. Those who agree not only in accepting the Christian Scriptures as containing a revelation of religious truth, but also in understanding the Bible to teach that this world is a revolted province of God's kingdom, that all men are depraved, and need regeneration and atonement; that the Word, who was God, became incarnate and died to make atonement, and



that the agency of the Holy Spirit works according to the eternal purpose of God, in regenerating and sanctifying the soul and delivering it from everlasting condemnation, can act together in a church; they can aim at common ends, and use common means to gain those ends. And those who take the opposite side, and deny these doctrines, cannot act with them; and the pretence of such to act with the former is a mockery of common sense. The utility of creeds, therefore, appears in the necessity of agreement of opinion in order to intelligent church action.

The utility of creeds is seen, also, in *preserving distinct and definite expressions* of truth, which the depravity of the world is constantly tending to displace with ignorance, error, and delusion. It is one doctrine of the Word of God, which ought to be in every church creed, that the unregenerate heart of man cherishes a dislike of the holy character, purposes, and law of God, and has ever "loved darkness rather than light." This is the true source of religious errors in the world. It is not so much the influence of false teachers, nor the original difference in the mental structure of men, which leads so many people into errors, as it is that "their foolish heart is darkened;" and they do not "like to retain God in their knowledge." It is a mournful fact that the great doctrines of the Bible fade away from the minds of men, unless the church holds forth continually the word of life, and especially those doctrines which are most exclusively essential portions of the divinely revealed system of truth. The consenting voice of the church is needed in the confession of its faith in those doctrines which lead the sinner to true and genuine conviction of sin, to humble dependence on God, and to regeneration which is by repentance and faith in Christ. The efforts of "the rulers of the darkness of this world" are aimed to prevent this blessed result. They often assail those revealed truths whose logical connections with other parts of the revealed system are not readily seen by many, but which are essential to the full and proper operation of the system in convincing of sin and regenerating the soul. The consequences of denying the deity of Christ, or the personality of the Holy Spirit, are not at once clearly seen by common minds. A common mind would not, at the first glance,

suppose that Arianism, for example, would send a pernicious influence through the whole of that system, which God has given to convince of sin and save the soul. But so it does; it sweeps away the doctrine of atonement, and so puts the sinner upon the vain effort to establish his own righteousness. Necessity is laid upon the churches to accept in their creeds the leading doctrines of Christianity for the sake of the emphatic and standing expression of those doctrines, which is thus given to the world. It has been objected that "errors have been canonized in creeds." Grant it; Paganism has had its dogmas, Mohammedanism its tenets, Popery its corrupt doctrines,—and various religionists their errors. So it will continue to be for the present in the world. But this is far from supplying a reason for a church of Christ to suppress its declaration of the truth; on the contrary, it is a good reason why the church should have a creed, and should make to the world a distinct and solemn expression of "the truth as it is in Jesus." It is thus that church membership comes to *mean* something; and it is thus that the church becomes "the light of the world."

Again, the utility of a creed will appear further if we consider it as *a help in the study of the Scriptures*. It is good to be aided in our study of the Word of God by systematized and discriminating statements of divine truth, using a creed as we use accurate and condensed systems in studying science. The ultimate authority in science is the great book of God's works, and not any book of Newton, Laplace, Linneus, or Cuvier. But who will say that it is not highly beneficial to the scholar to study the "*Principia*" of Newton, or the "*Mécanique Céleste*" of Laplace, as an aid to a thorough acquaintance with Natural Philosophy or of Astronomy? Yet the text-books of the schools are but scientific creeds derived from the great book of God's works. Nobody inveighs against the use of those creeds, as circumscribed, despotic, or unfavorable to progress. All consider it highly useful to have the facts of the world condensed and arranged into the creeds of science, and to study them as the wisest method of advancing to still further knowledge. Why should we not derive similar benefit from studying the accurate definitions and discriminating statements of a religious creed, and comparing it with the Word of God?

Take, for instance, the Westminster Assembly's Catechisms and Confession of Faith. Can you read and study those documents, without admiring them as concise expositions of Scriptural truth, which they have stated with a clearness, consistency, and discriminating exactness never yet surpassed? We do not ascribe perfection to every sentiment. You may dissent from some shades of thought which are taught in them; but we question whether any man can carefully read and thoroughly study them without finding himself benefited in a high degree, or without being aided in the study of the Scriptures, and helped onward in the knowledge of God and of Jesus Christ our Saviour. The same is true, more or less, of many other confessions.

It must be added, that the creed of a church, if it is discriminating and faithful to the Scriptures, benefits *the children of the covenant*. It is a guide in teaching them the first principles of the Christian System. Surely the children of the church are not to be left to grow up in ignorance, but they are to be brought up "in the nurture and admonition of the Lord." This implies early instruction and training, which is a necessary preparation of children for hearing the preaching of the Gospel with saving benefit, and so for full admission to the privileges of the church. They are to be regarded as were the catechumens in the early periods of Christianity, who were a class held under instruction in the doctrines of the Christian religion, preparatory to full membership in the church. The creed of a church is a brief manual of systematized, Scriptural truth, which is of great service as a guide in the religious training of the young.

Looking at past ages, we may discern, perhaps, an excessive tendency to rely on creeds; but that is not the tendency of this age. The tendency now is to the other extreme, which is equally an error — the disposition to underrate them. We have come to understand that creeds will not save us; with many, at the same time, there is that rashness which casts away the fruit of the pious intellectual toil of centuries. The use of creeds has respect to the honor of God, to the edification of the church, and to the recovery of the world to Christ. For, if God has given us a revelation of a scheme of truth for glorify-

ing Himself and manifesting to principalities and powers his manifold wisdom in saving sinners, it is surely to his honor that we should credit that revelation, and frankly avow our faith in the record which He has given us of his Son. This is to confess Christ before men. It is, moreover, conducive to the stability and peace of the church, to have the principles of the Gospel distinctly declared in the confession which is the bond of Christian union. And when persons have, before uniting with the church, endeavored to obtain certainty, or a fair and full decision upon the fundamental doctrines of the Gospel, and can say, "I know what I believe," they may be expected to derive comfort and strength from the open profession of that faith. They will be more free and manly to work in it, to hope in it, and to die in it. Besides, the profession is a testimony to the world, which the world needs, and which can be conveyed to it in no way so impressively as by the public avowal of our faith in the leading doctrines of the Gospel. Be it that some of the doctrines are offensive to unregenerate minds, and are accounted foolishness; still they are a part of our revealed Christianity, and really they are the wisdom of God. We have no reason to be reluctant to avow them, much less to be ashamed of the Gospel of Christ. Men need to learn what Christianity is, and to learn it, not only from preaching, but from the profession of Christians, that they may read the true Gospel of Christ from his "living Epistles," and that they may understand what, we think, should be the condition of membership in the church. It is a poor compliment, which those pay to the Christian religion, who reduce their articles of faith to the minimum of a simple declaration of belief in Christianity, or a few general platitudes of religious doctrine; as if the Bible had no positive and distinct revelations of momentous truth, but left us to grope in wide and foggy regions of theological indefiniteness. Certainly the Christian Scriptures warrant that definiteness of doctrinal statement in the creeds of our churches, which characterizes the theological expositions of Calvin, Edwards, or the Westminster Assembly. The independence of Congregational churches with respect to their creeds operates to diminish the traditional authority of the creeds, which prevails more in consolidated bodies of Presbyterians,

Episcopalians, or Methodists, but it encourages thought and stanch intelligent conviction in individuals in consenting to the standard of faith. In our congregational polity, we sacrifice something of the *esprit du corps* for the sake of individual strength and discrimination, and thereby gain a more complete union to Jesus Christ through an enlightened faith in the doctrines professed.

We must not lose sight of the unquestionable fact, that Christianity has an intense individuality, beginning its benign work with the individual, and not with the corporate church. "The kingdom of God is within you." It aims to regenerate the world by the conversion of individuals. It advances, "not with observation," but by the silent, unseen work in the quiet parish, and in the quiet heart. A standing in the church is secondary to personal godliness. When a person is converted, he will desire to occupy his proper place in the organization of the church, which is Christ's body. He must survey the Christian sects, and inquire how they severally understand the Bible, that he may enter that one whose creed and polity suit him best, as containing the system of doctrines taught in the Holy Scriptures. If he sees himself depraved, polluted, ruined, lost, in need of regeneration and atonement, then he could not accept the Universalist system, nor the Unitarian, nor the Pelagian, nor the Arminian system; but he can, in fundamentals, agree with any evangelical denomination. He must join the denomination with which his faith best agrees, and with which he can best act in harmony; where he shall find himself in the ranks of a sympathizing and consciously agreeing people, each individual strengthening his neighbor's hand. This sort of unity is a blessed union, not a blazoned pretence; it is a reality, not a sham.

It is no doubt better that, for the present, there should be a diversity of denominations. The Almighty Governor of the world deduces good from it. For illustration of this, we need only to call attention to what may be called the division of labor, like what is developed more and more in the industrial processes of civilized society. Men gain in expedition, efficiency, and heartiness in the several departments of work, by each one working according to his adaptations, and attain bet-

ter results by this balancing of forces in the division of labor. There is very little reason for the antagonisms of professions and trades. But even the delusive preference and prominence which each individual is apt to accord to his own calling may work well for society. So the diversity of the Christian sects, in the wisdom of Providence, operates, to a considerable extent, to bring about good results. Ideas of vital moment are kept alive by the zeal of sects; activity is stimulated by a really noble emulation; earnestness is maintained by rival bodies provoking each other to love and good works, — whereas, otherwise, they might sink into the dulness of a stupid and lifeless uniformity. These are not the highest motives of action. But in speaking of man, we have to acknowledge at every step that he is fallen. In his best estate, his motives are not often the simplest and the highest which might be; but they are strongly mixed. In the multiplicity of sects, God is ordering it well, that Christian love and zeal should flow through the world not in one broad river, making its immediate banks verdant and fruitful, and leaving the rest an arid desert, but in many little rivers, creeks, and rills, fertilizing the mountain sides and the valleys in their course. There are differences of temperament, cast of mind, and education which demand different shades of doctrinal statement and different modes of administration and church action.

The advocacy of an honest and uncompromising creed is not a plea for sectarianism, nor is its aim or tendency to divide. Sectarianism, fired with “a zeal of God, but not according to knowledge,” is an evil, which has often plagued the church. But sectarianism in the church of Christ is not the only evil, nor the worst. Laodicean apathy is a deeper evil. The tendency of poor drowsy humanity is to fall asleep, and lapse into a spiritual state of stagnation, indifference, death. In that state, men hide their eyes from the light of God’s Word, — have a distaste for creeds and doctrinal discussion, and, omitting the weightier matters of the Christian religion, they content themselves with loyalty to man, with the custom of society, and an easy respectability. Sectarianism is antagonistic to this, and merits some mitigation of our condemnation of it for its protest and resistance against a form of depravity so odious and de-

structive. The Christian ought to desire union. But what union? The answer is, that union in which Christians are "of one mind and one spirit"; in which the watchmen shall "see eye to eye" and speak the same "truth in love"; and in which the church shall act together for common ends and by common means. A disposition to divide is surely bad in its nature. Yet, as the world is, there must be division, and the truth proves the occasion of it. The Lord Jesus apprised his disciples of his bringing division into the world. Every great revival of religion has occasioned division and debate. This fact is important. It is well to settle it in our minds that Christianity is an unwelcome light in this dark world, a fermenting leaven, a two-edged sword piercing to heal, and tending always to "turn the world upside down." And no yearning for peace must be permitted to neutralize this effect, nor to abate our zeal to spread the Gospel of our Lord.

In our endeavors to leaven the world with Christianity, we should work in hope, depending on God to give demonstration and power to the truth for the salvation of individual souls. The world has too entirely cut itself off from allegiance to God to warrant the hope of its being easily and speedily won back and reconciled by simple declaration of error, and proclamation of truth. Hope that kindles at the idea of the world's being friendly to the reception of Gospel truth, will end in disappointment and sorrow. We must hold fast the form of sound words, and preach the Gospel to all the world, — gathering ever fresh and exultant hope from the promise of our Lord, "Lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world." Great is the office of the theologian and pastor. Soundness in doctrine is of vital importance. So is the Spirit of Christianity, the heart in the ministerial work, the human sympathy, which can be acquired in no school but that of Christ. The grand practical work before him is the world's conversion, — that done, all is done. He may not see it accomplished, but he should labor for it; so should all Christians, and then expect, at the end, to receive the crown.



## ARTICLE VII.

## GIBEAH — A LESSON FOR THE TIMES.

"And the people repented them for Benjamin, because that the Lord had made a breach in the tribes of Israel." — *Judges* xxi. 15.

THIS was while Phinehas was high-priest, and therefore during "the days of the elders that overlived Joshua," and while Israel yet "served the Lord." Yet idolatry had begun to creep in, and had not been punished, and there was a growing relaxation of manners and morals, which the magistrates did not repress.

A crime, equalled in vileness and atrocity only by that attempted, but not accomplished, in Sodom on the night before its destruction, had been committed in Gibeah. Gibeah was a city of Benjamin, of seven hundred fighting men, and therefore of three or four thousand inhabitants. But a few of them could have been engaged in the crime, or had any knowledge of it when committed.

The principal surviving sufferer, though a conscientious, religious man, of easy temper, was terribly exasperated, and, instead of appealing to the elders of Gibeah, or of Benjamin, whose duty it was to punish the crime, made a most awfully exciting appeal to all Israel against them. The appeal took effect. A mass meeting of four hundred thousand was held at Mizpeh, and Benjamin "heard" of it. The sufferer addressed the meeting, and they swore vengeance against Gibeah. They sent messengers through the whole tribe of Benjamin, charging the tribe, virtually, with connivance at this wickedness, and demanding that the criminals should be delivered up to be punished. Many of the Benjamites, probably, never heard of the crime before, and were incensed at what seemed to them an unjust accusation. The demand, too, was unconstitutional. It was not the duty of Benjamin to deliver up the criminals, but to punish them; and if they had felt as they ought about the crime, they would have punished them, notwithstanding any provocation to the contrary. But instead of that, they thought only of the unjust accusation and unlawful demand,

and prepared to defend their constitutional rights by force of arms.

Israel, not doubting that God was on their side against such atrocious wickedness, resolved on immediate war, without asking him whether further attempts should be made to procure justice peaceably. They only asked which tribe should go up first. He designated Judah, usually the leading tribe, and the tribe to which the murdered woman belonged. They had vowed a war of extermination, that should not leave man, woman, child, beast, or unburned city. And they devoted to utter destruction every Israelite who hesitated to go the full length with the party. Confident in their overwhelming numbers, they marched "onward to" Gibeah, and, to their astonishment and dismay, were driven back with the loss of twenty-two thousand men. They were not fit to conquer. Their fierce exasperation against one sin, while so careless about other sins, did not secure the favor of God.

They prepared for another battle; but, somewhat humbled and softened, they asked the Lord whether they should again attack Benjamin their "brother." They did not call him their "brother" before. The answer was, "Go up against him." Benjamin had decidedly put himself in the wrong by protecting the criminals, instead of punishing them, and must be punished. They made the second attack, much in the spirit of the first, and were again defeated, with the loss of eighteen thousand men.

This amount of blood-letting seems to have reduced the fever of their excitement, and they were now sincerely desirous of divine guidance, and even willing to abandon the war, if God should say that it was their duty; but God commanded them to go on with it; and though their spirit was even now but partially right, he promised them victory. No longer rash with self-confidence, they made prudent strategical arrangements for the third battle, which the Benjamites, elated by two victories, neglected. The result was, a complete victory of the Israelites, followed up with an exterminating fury, which, though they had vowed it, was unjustifiable. None were left of Benjamin, either man, woman, child, or beast, except six hundred fighting men, who escaped to the Rock Rimmon, where they abode four months.

These four months gave the Israelites time for reflection. They were shocked and distressed at their own horrid work in this fratricidal war. They "repented them for Benjamin their brother," and "because the Lord had made a breach in the tribes of Israel." They could not endure the thought, that even one tribe should be missing from their Union, and set themselves at work earnestly to reconstruct the ruins of Benjamin. In this work, they found themselves painfully embarrassed by the angry vows they had made in their exasperation, and forced to the adoption of measures which could not be justified. But nothing could hinder them from reëstablishing their "brother Benjamin" in his ancient position, as one of the co-equal tribes of Israel. The Benjamites, thoroughly humbled, gladly accepted the kind offices of their brethren. The original dispute seems to have been forgotten by both parties. It does not appear that the criminals were ever delivered up. Very probably, they all fell in battle, or in the indiscriminate butchery which followed; but no inquiry seems to have been made concerning them in the final settlement.

This lesson is too plain to need comment. It contains a prophecy, which has been fulfilled, as yet, only in part;—only as far as "BULL RUN."

---

## ARTICLE VIII.

### LITERARY NOTICES.

*Thomas Paine*: New American Cyclopædia, Vol. XII. New York : D. Appleton & Co. 1861.

Is history what its compilers choose to make it; or is it that which actually lived and was? Are dictionaries, lexicons, cyclopædias, repositories of facts; or looms in which to weave tissues of fancy and fable? We are reminded of a small bit of authentic history in point. When this New American Cyclopædia began to fill its shelf in our sanctum with its successive instalments, we asked a friend if he in-

tended to take it in? With a knowing look he (himself both a fine philosophic and historical scholar), shook his head, affirming that the best of these compilations are only the opinions of their editors, and are no sufficient authority in thorough investigations. We begin to think our friend was right. Much as the work has pleased us in its former general features, we have here struck the *pons asinorum*, and find it a broken bridge. The life of Thomas Paine is written, leaving out just that which made him Thomas Paine, as much as *his* christian patriotism made George Washington the rightful owner of all which that name of honor and goodness covers.

It may be well enough, in a work like this, to let the members of a sect or a school tell its own story, if other guards are added to correct partial and unduly apologetic views. Thus, in the old "Encyclopædia Americana," we had the article "Jesuit" first by a member of that order, and then, by a Protestant writer, between which one could "square up the corners," as a bricklaying neighbor of ours is fond of saying. But here the corners are nowhere, and the whole thing *leans* worse than the campanile of Pisa. Paine was a coarse, licentious, drunken, swearing infidel; untrue to his friends, quarrelsome, and utterly unclean. He wrote the "Age of Reason" as well as the "Common Sense." What "common sense" he had was neither moral or religious, but only political. His "age of reason" never came. His name belongs to the catalogue of Cain and Judas, upon whom God may have mercy if he can; but whom men must only pity, not defend or excuse.

This article of a half dozen solid pages is full of perversions and suppressions. It is a piece of special pleading in a very bad cause. It brings in a verdict which the world will not accept, because it knows the judgment is not true. Thomas Paine cannot so be white-washed into a decent patriot and philanthropist. We would not ask, in a summary like this, a detailed account of so lost a life. But we had a right to expect a just *resumé* of the case; and particularly this, which is the chief lesson of his career—that no degree of intellectual power can save the memory of a thoroughly corrupted man from the deserved abhorrence of the ages which come after. What has our cyclopedist done? He glosses over the vulgar infidelity of Paine's writings as being no worse than the current free-thinking of the times (a slander on our fathers); he has a very broad cloak of obviously sympathetic charity to throw over a book which involved its publishers in America and in Britain in criminal prosecutions, on the sole charge of its blasphemies (of all of which this apology is profoundly ignorant); he says nothing about the sense of outraged virtue, in

both these countries, which rose up in righteous indignation against this man as a foe of goodness, when his full-grown vileness of mind and heart became visible — but attempts to show that, instead of this, the opposition against him was a Federalist persecution of a Jeffersonian politician; he leaves out his personal dissipations, and domestic infidelities, as if he were a Rechab or a Joseph; and the death-bed scenes detailed by his physician, Dr. Manly, will never startle the wicked with a looking-for of judgment, so far as this oblivious record is concerned. In all of this there is a *suppressio veri* which, on purely historical as well as moral and Christian grounds, amounts to an aggravated uttering of falsehood.

We speak strongly, for the offence is grievous. This article is not an ephemeral newspaper or magazine affair, nor even a book-biography which one may buy or refuse to buy as he pleases. It is installed in the heart of a serial which is to stand as an authority for years to come; the volumes of which, its purchasers began to procure in good faith that (while it might not agree with many of their opinions) it should be at least historically just and reliable. Several of our periodicals have urged that this obnoxious article be removed from future editions of the volume in question. It is a perfectly right request. We should be glad if the purchasers of the work thus far would refuse to invest a mill in this volume of it, as some we know will do; and let the gap in the set suggest its own explanation, until it can be better filled than with this lucubration of "Mr. Joseph N. Morceau," author of a contemporaneous tract entitled "Testimonials to the merits of Thomas Paine," as an appendix to which this *morceau* would find a much more appropriate place.

*The History of England from the Accession of James II.* By LORD MACAULAY. Vol. V. Edited by his Sister, LADY TREVELYAN. With Additional Notes to Vols. I., II., III. and IV. A Sketch of Lord Macaulay's Life and Writings. By S. AUSTIN ALLIBONE. And a Complete Index to the Entire Work. Boston: Crosby, Nichols, Lee & Co. 1861. pp. 335.

THE bare printing of this full title-page would be enough to suggest to our readers the value of this volume — the last we are to have from the gifted author. We could bestow no higher praise than to say, that this volume is written with all the brilliancy, research, and power of its predecessors; while its Notes give additional value to them. The Sketch of his Life and Writings is a clear summary of

the evidences of his wonderful literary merit, his peerless memory, his genius as an essayist, an orator, a poet, and a most charming friend and conversationalist.

*Minnie Carleton.* By MARY BELLE BARTLETT. For sale at the Store of the Mass. S. S. Society. 1861. pp. 245.

THIS is a charming little book for putting into the hands of a bright, thoughtful girl, who sometimes longs to learn how to be good and useful. It is written in a beautiful and feeling style, and seems to aim to show how a young person may live so as to constrain brothers, sisters, associates, one after another, to say there *is* a beautiful and attractive reality in religion.

#### NEW PUBLICATIONS RECEIVED.

*The Confessions of Augustine.* Edited, with an Introduction, by WILLIAM G. T. SHEDD. Andover: Warren F. Draper. Boston: Gould & Lincoln. pp. 417.

*The Recreations of a Country Parson.* First Series. Boston: Ticknor & Fields.

*The Recreations of a Country Parson.* Second Series. Boston: Ticknor & Fields.

#### PAMPHLETS.

*Scriptural Evidence of the Deity of Christ.* By REV. DAVID B. FORD, A. M. South Scituate, Mass. Reprinted from the Bibliotheca Sacra for July, 1860. Andover: Warren F. Draper. Boston: Gould & Lincoln. pp. 42.

*The State and the Nation: Sacred to Christian Citizens.* A Sermon preached in All Souls' Church, New York, April 21, 1861. By HENRY W. BELLOWES. New York: James Miller, Successor to C. S. Francis & Co. 522 Broadway. pp. 16.

*Sermons on the Country's Crisis.* Delivered in Mount Vernon, N. H., April 28, 1861. By C. E. LORD, Pastor of the Congregational Church. Milford: Printed at Boutwell's Newspaper, Book and Job Office. pp. 20.

## ARTICLE IX.

## SHORT SERMONS.

"For the nation and kingdom that will not serve thee shall perish; yea, those nations shall be utterly wasted." — *Isaiah* lx. 12.

THE text is given as a reason for the future splendid triumph of Messiah's kingdom, which the prophet is here painting.

The object of the text is the clear and emphatic announcement of the fact that *the law of God applies to Nations*.

National governments as well as individual persons must keep the moral law. In their national capacity and public acts they must adhere to the letter and spirit of the Decalogue, or the God who gave it, and who stands behind it to enforce it, will grind them to powder in the constantly rolling mill of his providence.

The destruction of nations will of course be different from the destruction of persons, according to their difference of constitution and duration. Persons have a future state of being for which this life is probationary and disciplinary. Hence, contrary to the arguments of Job's friends, they never receive *punishment* in this world. The greatest offenders may be prospered through life. They have more than heart can wish, and there are no bands in their death. Not so with nations. It is thought no case can be found in history where a nation has prospered or long survived while setting the law of God at defiance. Such is the evidence abundantly furnished in the familiar volume entitled "God in History."

The reason is plain enough. National governments exist for God and the accomplishment of his purposes. By his permission, and for the accomplishment of his kingdom, the magistrate bears the sword for the punishment of evil-doers.

If we inquire what constitutes a national refusal to serve God, the reply is at hand. The persistent disregard of any one of the ten commandments is clearly such a refusal. The law is the transcript of God and the rule for his service. It constitutes a unit. Every part is essential to every other part. If one may be allowed to disregard the sacredness of the Sabbath, stealing and murder cannot by any authority be prohibited, for the sacredness of property and life rests on the same authority with that of the Sabbath. Hence the Apostle declares, that the violator of one point of the law "is guilty of all."

In the light of this subject, the late battle in Virginia, offered so needlessly by our government on the Sabbath, is full of portent and



warning. May not that inexplicable panic just on the eve of victory be regarded as the finger of God's rebuke to call the nation to solemn consideration?

Moreover we are constrained to say that the violations of God's day are multiplying all around us in the government. With all our resources we cannot contend with God and prosper. Our only hope now is that the people of the land are repudiating the act, and will cry out against it; that our rulers will repent of it, and of all our national corruption and disregard of moral principles. Here hangs the great question now asked so anxiously by tens of thousands, — Will the Constitution, the Government, and the Union right up again from the fearful tornado that, long gathering, has now suddenly burst upon us in all its fury? Will the good ship of State weather the storm and save its precious freight of freedom and equality for the world, or will she drift, break up, and go down?

“For the nation and kingdom that will not serve thee shall perish.”

---

“Though your sins be as scarlet, they shall be as white as snow; though they be red like crimson, they shall be as wool.” — *Isaiah* i. 18.

Here the desperate *persistence and incurableness* of sin are set forth by comparing them to the deep and fixed colors so well known in the East. The prophet had just represented Israel as so stricken and bruised for his correction that there was no sound or sensitive spot left “from the sole of the foot even unto the head” on which a new wound could be inflicted. Neither multiplied blessings, nor long continued stripes and sufferings availed in the least for the eradication of sin and the purification of sinners. This permanent character of sin, therefore, is strikingly likened to those brilliant dyes which were wrought into the original fibres of cloth, and, among the ancients, regarded as ineradicable and unfading.

White being the common emblem of innocence and purity, guilt was naturally represented by that which is deepest stained. “Scarlet” is the bright red color which was obtained from the eggs of a small insect found on the leaves of the oak in Spain and in countries east of the Mediterranean. Cotton was dipped into it, and came out a livid, or blood red; some say it nearly resembled fire. It was worn by females in the time of Saul, and in later times was the distinguishing dress of kings and princes, and was finally adopted both by the Babylonian and Median soldiers. “Crimson” was the deep red slightly tinged with blue obtained from a shell-fish called “*purpura*,” which

abounded near Tyre. It is the celebrated Tyrian purple, used for dying wool, and is commonly rendered in the Bible "blue." It was much employed in the construction of the Tabernacle, and in the garments of the high-priest.

The force of the metaphor lies in the admitted strength and *fixedness*, as well as depth and glariness of these colors. No usage, exposure, nor washings could remove them. Such is the nature of sin in man. No human power, no rights, no repentance, no resolves, no prayers, nor tears nor penances avail to remove or lessen its guilt. It is deep-fixed in the heart, as scarlet in the cotton and crimson in the wool.

"No bleeding bird, nor bleeding beast,  
Nor hyssop branch, nor sprinkling priest,  
Nor running brook, nor flood, nor sea,  
Can wash the dismal stain away."

Sin is so fixed and incurable because its seat is so deep in the soul. In the centre of our moral being, where the will, the affections, the thoughts, imaginings, tastes, and aims, take their rise, there is its strong citadel and seat of government.

The guilty stain of sin is not in the actions, for the same actions may be right at one time and wrong at another. Nor is the crimson dye to be charged to the passions. For these may cool and change all the way from childhood to old age, and yet the soul constantly increase in guilt. The hot, impulsive passions of youth are certainly no *more* offensive than the more concealed and better controlled passions of manhood and age. The evil passions are but the outgrowth, the results of sin ruling in the heart and nature.

Nor yet is the source and seat of sin to be found in the direct, conscious *choices* of the soul. Paul speaks out the deeper experience of mankind when he says, (Rom. vii.) "The good that I would I do not; but the evil which I would not that I do. I see another law in my members warring against the law of my mind and bringing me into captivity to the law of sin which is in my members." He closes by admitting his helplessness, and crying out for a deliverer.

David, in his confession, like Luther and Augustine, and thousands of eminent Christians, refers his guilt back to its deep native domination in the soul. "I was shapen in iniquity." An ancient and much used confessional hymn runs, —

"Lord I am vile — conceived in sin,  
And born unholy and unclean;  
Sprung from the man whose guilty fall  
Corrupts the race, and taints us all.

" Soon as we draw our infant breath,  
 The seeds of sin grow up for death ;  
 Thy law demands a perfect heart ;  
 But we're defiled in every part."

But though sin is so deep and fixed in our nature, though we are so helpless in its slavery, thanks be to God, he hath found out a ransom. The text contains a positive and glorious pledge of God, that sin can be eradicated on the conditions given. " Though your sins be as scarlet, they shall be as white as snow ; though they be red like crimson, they shall be as wool."

---

## ARTICLE X.

### THE ROUND TABLE.

NEW WRECKS ON OLD ROCKS. — When one of our contributors reviewed "The Theology of Plymouth Pulpit," and showed its vast deficiencies in some respects and glaring unsoundness in others, it was thought by some to be a work uncalled for. A part deemed the weekly teachings of that Pulpit at home and through the *Independent* and *Traveller* unworthy of any public notice, however unsound they were. Others thought the critique the outburst of an old school feeling, so splenetic and dogmatic and illiberal, that it could tolerate no teachings unless set forth in the *ipsissimis verbis* of the Westminster Catechism. Doubtless our contributor wrote in all kindness of feeling toward the incumbent of Plymouth Pulpit, and with a deep sense of responsibility to Christ and his doctrine and church. If he had any fears that he had overdone a painful duty, or excited undue alarm among the lovers of the ancient faith, recent disclosures of that pulpit, and disclaimers of its teachings must quiet him.

We are comforted, in the trying work we performed, by the fact that the new Boston Light, thus placed on Beecher's Rocks, is beginning to be acknowledged and used by some of those who had denied that there were any rocks in that channel.

A sermon of the Plymouth Pulpit on Justification, and published in the *Independent* of July 4, has alarmed even his publishers and friends. Mr. Beecher takes occasion to say in this sermon, that " theologians have put forth the absurd notion that God has made a plan of salvation." After caricaturing, in his inimitable way, this notion of a plan, he continues : " Is not the whole of this talk about a plan of salvation a mess of sheer ignorance, not to say nonsense?" . . . " Not

on account of any arrangement he has made, not on account of any expedient he has set up, not on account of any settlement or plan that he has fixed, but on account of what he is, he looks upon a sinful man and says: 'I so love you that I accept you just as if you were not sinful.'"

The *Independent* confesses to be "somewhat surprised" at these sentiments of Mr. B.; admits that he "caricatures" the common theory of a plan of salvation, and "hardly mentions that which the Scriptures make the very essence of the atoning sacrifice — the death of Christ upon the Cross as a propitiation."

And it admits, too, that it is led to make this rebuke only after "the views of Mr. Beecher in the sermon here cited are condemned by several religious journals as a dangerous heresy, and the *Independent* is censured for giving them publicity." It excuses it all, however, as a "rhetorical excursus" against strait theologians of the *Princeton Repertory* and *Boston Review* stamp. For ourselves we confess frankly to believing that God has a plan of salvation, and that we are, therefore, justly exposed to such a "rhetorical excursus," as "hardly mentions the very essence of the atoning sacrifice," when unfolding the doctrine of Justification by Faith. As yet we are so far Protestants evangelical as to hold with Luther to this "*articulum stantis vel cadentis ecclesiae*."

The *Chicago Herald* is "alternately filled with admiration and consternation," as it confesses. It "grieves to see such loose theology circulated in the columns of the *Independent*." And then to show how the friends of the *Independent* in the West feel about the publication of such teachings, it quotes from a private letter to the editors of the *Herald*. The writer, it says, is a "progressive minister," and has been a staunch friend of the *Independent*. The letter says: "Is H. W. Beecher as much of a Unitarian as his last published sermon would indicate? What are we to do? Are the editors of the *Independent* themselves on the high road to Unitarianism? . . . Beecher may ridicule orthodoxy once a month the year round, and pitch into the doctrines we preach, and on which we rest our salvation, and not an editorial pen has one word of reply or rebuke. . . . I am exceedingly distressed in view of that man's sermons. . . . I have taken the *Independent* a long time, have recommended it, and aided to some extent its circulation. May God forgive me! *All the religion* that it now brings to its readers is in the sermon, and that is such a religion as our denomination did not formerly relish."

The *Congregationalist* echoes by quotation the gentle and apologetic caveats of the *Independent*, but has no original warning, or protest, or surprise.

Nor must we omit the manly declaration of the *Congregational Journal*,—so like itself. "If we rightly understand him, the doctrine of Justification by Faith, as revealed in the Scriptures, and received by the Protestant world, as embodying all the cardinal doctrines of Christianity, he totally subverts, and treats with most offensive levity."

The conviction grows with us that our contributor did not speak too early or too plainly of "The Theology of Plymouth Pulpit."

MRS. ELIZABETH BARRETT BROWNING has gone from earth to join the immortals. Her frail body failed longer to imprison that soaring, mighty soul, and she died in Florence June 29th. In common with the religious literary world we lift up our wail of sorrow at her early departure. Yet our sorrow is tempered by the reflection that she is henceforth to be associated for higher and, it may be, more important and useful employment of her poetic genius, with the band of the world's greatest poets, at the head of whom are Isaiah and David, as they sing before the throne the growing praises and triumph of the "Lamb that was slain."

But though she has gone, her bold and great creations remain; and we cling to them and wander over the new-found worlds of original beauty and literary and religious fruits with only increased interest. In "Aurora Leigh" we read perhaps the strangest and sublimest poetic prose novel that was ever written. In "The Seraphim" we shall never weary of trying to catch an awe-stricken angel's view of the crucifixion scene. In "The Drama of Exile" we tread the path of Milton's "Paradise Lost" as it were a new and better road under the guidance of the truest womanly grace and tenderness as well as the loftiest and most courageous genius.

In both the poems and letters of this gifted Christian woman we find the greatest strength, the highest imagination, and the most versatile knowledge that are ever given to mortals.

We trust she now realizes the anticipation which she addressed to the angels at the close of "The Seraphim."

"I, too, may haply smile another day  
At the far recollection of this lay,  
When God may call me in your midst to dwell,  
To hear your most sweet music's miracle  
And see your wondrous faces. May it be!  
For His remembered sake, the Slain on rood,  
Who rolled his earthly garment red in blood  
(Treading the wine-press) that the weak, like me,  
Before his heavenly throne should walk in white."